

Volume 13

1990-1

Number 1

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction



Symposium on
Change in the Social Order

A CHALCEDON PUBLICATION

COPYRIGHT

The Journal of Christian Reconstruction

Volume 13 / Number 1

1990–91

Symposium on Change in the Social Order

Garry J. Moes, Editor

ISSN 0360–1420.

A CHALCEDON MINISTRY

Electronic Version 1.0 / 2012

Copyright © 1991 Chalcedon Foundation. All rights reserved.

Usage: Copies of this file may be made for personal use by the original purchaser of this electronic document. It may be printed by the same on a desktop printer for personal study. Quotations may be used for the purpose of review, comment, or scholarship. However, this publication may not be duplicated or reproduced in whole or in part in any electronic or printed form by any means, uploaded to a web site, or copied to a CD-ROM, without written permission from the publisher.

Chalcedon Foundation

P.O. Box 158

Vallecito, California 95251

U.S.A.

To contact via email and for other information:

www.chalcedon.edu

Chalcedon depends on the contributions of its readers,
and all gifts to Chalcedon are tax-deductible.

Opinions expressed in this journal do not necessarily reflect the views of Chalcedon. It has provided a forum for views in accord with a relevant, active, historic Christianity, though those views may have on occasion differed somewhat from Chalcedon's and from each other.

THE JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

This *Journal* is dedicated to the fulfillment of the cultural mandate of Genesis 1:28 and 9:1—to subdue the earth to the glory of God. It is published by the Chalcedon Foundation, an independent Christian educational organization (see inside back cover). The perspective of the *Journal* is that of orthodox Christianity. It affirms the verbal, plenary inspiration of the original manuscripts (autographs) of the Bible and the full divinity and full humanity of Jesus Christ—two natures in union (but without intermixture) in one person.

The editors are convinced that the Christian world is in need of a serious publication that bridges the gap between the newsletter-magazine and the scholarly academic journal. The editors are committed to Christian scholarship, but the *Journal* is aimed at intelligent laymen, working pastors, and others who are interested in the reconstruction of all spheres of human existence in terms of the standards of the Old and New Testaments. It is not intended to be another outlet for professors to professors, but rather a forum for serious discussion within Christian circles.

The Marxists have been absolutely correct in their claim that theory must be united with practice, and for this reason they have been successful in their attempt to erode the foundations of the non-communist world. The editors agree with the Marxists on this point, but instead of seeing in revolution the means of fusing theory and practice, we see the fusion in personal regeneration through God's grace in Jesus Christ and in the extension of God's kingdom. Good principles should be followed by good practice; eliminate either, and the movement falters. In the long run, it is the kingdom of God, not Marx's "kingdom of freedom," which shall reign triumphant. Christianity will emerge victorious, for only in Christ and His revelation can men find both the principles of conduct and the means of subduing the earth. the principles of Biblical law.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Faith and Change

Garry J. Moes 1

1. REVOLUTION

The Religion of Revolution

Rousas John Rushdoony 9

The Shape of Events (Our Revolution)

Otto Scott..... 25

2. CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER

The Crisis in Civilization

Otto Scott..... 37

Strategy for a New Century

William N. Blake..... 69

Lord of Life. The Confession of Lordship and Saving Faith

Joseph P. Braswell 81

The Covenant and the Character of a Nation

J.S. Wormser, trans. Gilbert Zekveld.....
113.

Romans 13:1–7. Paul, The Church and Social Order

J. Daryl Charles 125

3. EDUCATION AND CHANGE

Revolution Via Education

Samuel Blumenfeld..... 145

What is Education?

Otto Scott..... 161

Education for Service

Ovld Need..... 175

4. ECONOMICS AND CHANGE

Successful Stewardship

Joseph R. McAullffe..... 179

Love and Money. The Priority of People Over Things

R.E. McMaster Jr. 185

Poverty and Spirituality. An Examination of Biblical Categories

J. Daryl Charles..... 209

5. GRASS ROOTS CHANGE

Reconstruction in Action. Special Report

Garry J. Moes 221

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This issue, and especially the report beginning on page 221, was made possible by a gift from James Bilezikian, who felt that it was important for people to gain an over-all impression of what is being accomplished today by Christian Reconstruction. There is much, much more that could be chronicled, but we felt that this survey of what is happening in some key areas would best describe the implications of our faith. We are grateful to Mr. Bilezikian for suggesting such an issue of the Journal of Christian Reconstruction, and for funding it.

INTRODUCTION: FAITH AND CHANGE

Garry J. Moes, Editor

Stop me if you've heard this one. How many psychologists does it take to change a light bulb? Answer. One, but the light bulb has to want to change.

Silly. But not much more so than most of the answers the social "sciences" are giving us on the subject of change.

If our world had any of its remaining foundation in the truth, perhaps we could laugh off the silliness. But the tragi-comic reality is that social science nonsense by the couchful is being accepted with all seriousness as our societies desperately confront the increasing grimness that makes the need for change so urgent.

Beyond the obvious silliness, however, are the all-too-serious ideas which our modern age has adopted as rebellious men seek to establish a social order based on their own priorities. The most widely accepted of these ideas have been those which contemplate *revolution* as the primary means for change, the epitome of which was the French Revolution of 1789.

"The defining feature of the Revolution," said the Dutch historian, statesman and publicist Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer, "is its hatred of the Gospel, its anti-Christian nature. This feature marks the Revolution, not, mind you, when it 'deviates from its course' and 'lapses into excesses,' but, on the contrary, precisely when it holds to {2} its course and reaches the conclusion of its system, the true end of its logical development."

Why is this so? Because what we have come to know as revolution is, by its nature and consistent purpose, man's attempt to establish order in the world according to his own desires and purposes. When he attempts to do this, he immediately runs counter, of course, to the order which was set for the world before man found it desirable to set his own course. And he naturally then

clashes with the God who set the original course. Jacques Ellul, in considering one of history's first mass revolutions, the attempted civilization of Babel, described man's efforts in this regard as an "advance against God" (*The Meaning of the City*, 16).

"Man revolts against God and makes himself his own god; as a result, he then seeks to create his own social order, a paradise on earth," wrote R. J. Rushdoony (*Revolt Against Maturity*, 130).

Instead of paradise, however, man continues to construct a hell on earth. This is natural, Groen van Prinsterer noted, because of the origins of the idea of revolution. The anti-Christian nature of revolution is its characteristic mark, he said. "The Revolution can never shake it off. It is inherent in its very principle, and expresses and reflects its essence. It is the sign of its origin. It is the mark of hell."

When man attempts to install himself as god of the social order, there is no room for the God Who is There. When he puts faith in himself, he must withdraw or withhold faith in any Rival. Thus, since revolution is man's attempt to make himself god of his own social order, it is easy to see why Groen saw *unbelief* as the root cause of revolution. In a series of lectures delivered in The Hague during the winter of 1845–46, Groen clearly demonstrated from the philosophies which led up to the Age of Revolution...

...that the real formative power throughout the revolutionary era, right up to our own time, has been atheism, godlessness, *belng without God*. It is this feature that has given the Revolution its peculiar stamp, in its essence and in its practical results, in its doctrine and in its application. From the unbelieving nature of the Revolution one can predict its history. And inversely, one can discern in the facts of its history the constant tokens of its unbelieving origin (*Lecture VIII*).

Revolutionary thought has, indeed, manifested itself in history—leading both to and from the Age of Revolution (whose focal point {3} was in the eighteenth century). In our modern age, as in all ages, it has been evident in each of the key facets of social order, which we, in the Symposium presented within this edition, are grouping into the fundamentals of politics, education and economics—with religion (broadly defined) being the force which drives all of them.

In our first section, theologian Rushdoony and historian-

commentator Otto Scott explore revolution as a means of social change. Rev. Rushdoony first discusses the destructive and debased nature of the religion of revolution. Social and environmental change, he points out, is man's hope for salvation from the foul predicament in which he constantly find himself as a fallen creature.

While the Christian places his hope in the saving power of God's revealed grace, humanistic man places his faith and hope in revolutionary change, Rushdoony says, demonstrating why the Christian cannot afford to compromise on his position.

Mr. Scott, in the first of several essays included in this *Journal*, outlines the scope of our present-day revolutionary milieu and its historic foundations. "The struggle to take control of the nation from inside Congress is no different than the methods applied successfully in France so long ago, in the Russian Duma so long ago, and in the German Reichstag so long ago," writes Mr. Scott. "They seem foreign and different only to those who are unacquainted with revolution, and who harbor the quaint illusion that the United States is immune from the processes of unchecked revolution."

In the second section, our Symposium participants explore how Christianity, historically and doctrinally, impacts the social order and provides practical answers to man's search for meaning and order in life. Mr. Scott begins this analysis with a discussion of the English Puritans' efforts to establish a Christian social order on a national basis. He offers his opinion as to why the Cromwellian experiment failed, despite its astonishing and, in some respects, lasting accomplishments. He continues in this same essay with a further development of the scope of our civilization's present crisis and a concluding statement on our only hope for redemption from this crisis.

William Blake, a church leader and writer from Mount Vernon, Washington, USA, next proposes, from Scripture, a fundamental strategy for redirecting civilization as we emerge from the horrors and chaos of the twentieth century. Mr. Blake finds in ancient Israel's most basic confession of faith the foundations for a Christian social order. The SHEMA, Israel's acknowledgment of the Lordship of its sovereign God, "urges us to love God as the center and sole purpose of our life, and it tells us that our love for

God must issue from our whole being.” This is, of course, the only sure foundation for any society, since it transforms our individual selves, our families and our institutions, the essential components of human society. The *SHEMA*, in addition to calling us to personal discipline and holiness, “places two requirements upon all of us for social action,” Mr. Blake notes. “One is in the educational field so that our religion is preserved on the earth and God’s kingdom is accordingly advanced. The other is in the economic realms where we are expected to achieve economic security by obedience to God’s law.” (These two realms are explored in two other sections of our Symposium)

Continuing with the idea of the importance of Lordship confession is an essay by Joseph P. Braswell of Plant City, Florida. The essay argues, as the author himself describes it, “for the centrality of Lordship-confession as [being] of the very essence of saving faith.” Mr. Braswell argues that this conception of faith lies at the heart of any Christian effort to establish society under the rule of God’s law (theonomy) and the stewardship of the world by man under God’s authority (dominion theology). Faith based on Lordship-confession “does not place obedience in antithesis to faith as is common in modern evangelicalism. Rather this is a theocentric obedience of faith which stands opposed to humanism and autonomy, asserting the “crown rights of King Jesus.”

Next in our examination of the relationship between Christian confession and society is a new translation of an essay written in the mid-nineteenth century by a close friend of Groen van Prinsterer, J.A. Wormser. Part of the Anti-Revolutionary movement in The Netherlands, Wormser’s observations are candid in their recognition of the impact of revolutionary philosophy upon the modern age but adamant in their insistence that Christianity must remain the central force in society. “We do not deny that the revolution has become part of our history,” he says, “but we maintain that the nation which at one time changed from a non-Christian to a Christian nation is not ready to change its Christian character for an atheistic character.” As others in this Symposium have argued, Wormser highlights the centrality of Christian confession, as sealed in covenantal baptism, in maintaining the Godly character of family, church and society. “The Lord has placed us in His covenant of grace in order that we by His grace,

and in communion with Him, shall be comforted and *walk* in the future {5} hope of eternal glory. Increasingly we should learn to understand that the means as well as the results are the fruits of His free and eternal election. and that the way for us to come to full assurance of faith is by *the life of faith itself.*” This is the way of Christian Reconstruction of the social order.

When we consider social order, we inevitably come to the realm of polity—the civil order—and this brings up the question of civil authority or government. This facet of social order, in fact, has become the focal point of humanistic programs for change. There are few quarters of civilization in which the state has not become the center of life and the hope for salvation from social disintegration. The irony is, however, that this very fact is at the heart of social disintegration today. It is essential, then, that we understand what role civil authority has in social order—where its boundaries are and what contributions it *can* rightly make toward social integration. Catonsville, Maryland, biblical scholar J. Daryl Charles of Westminster Seminary offers us an examination of one of Scripture’s most definitive passages on this subject. Romans 13:1–7. Mr. Charles takes the unconventional view that this passage speaks on the subject of social order, not, as is commonly thought, as an outline of civil government’s prerogatives and duties, but as an outline of *Christian conduct* or good behavior by citizens in the face of political realities. Paul’s concern in this passage is anti-revolutionary, he suggests. Paul’s teaching here is a call for “sober conduct as opposed to rebellious tendencies” when one finds oneself living in circumstances like those which the church faced during its first days in the evil Roman empire. This sober conduct is essential to the church’s central social mission of proclaiming the cause of Christ—in any age.

For humanists, change has generally been accomplished by one or both of two means. For the impatient radical, social change must be wrought by violent and cataclysmic revolution. While this approach is dangerous enough, the second approach may be more so, because of its insidious subtleties. revolution through education. Violent revolutions are clearly disruptive, but in their blatancy, they can be readily confronted. Social change by slower evolutionary means through education, on the other hand, will creep almost unnoticed into a society until that society

awakes one day to find itself radically altered—all through means which seemed at the time to be furthering its development and expanding its understandings. Education, therefore, has become the key instrument of social {6} change in our time—both as the companion to violent revolution and a substitute for it. If Christian Reconstruction is to occur, education must be redeemed and pressed into the service of the Kingdom of God. This is explored in the next section of our Symposium.

Samuel L. Blumenfeld of Boston, Mass., USA, one of America's leading Christian authors and experts on education, leads off the discussion with an historical examination of how the Fabian Socialists of Europe and the United States captured education and turned it into an instrument of servitude for their elitist cause and their own thirst for power over the minds of men. Mr. Blumenfeld cites John Dewey's messianic credo as clear proof of the collectivists' designs. "I believe that every teacher ... is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth. I believe that in this way the teacher always is the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God." The problem with Dewey's vision was his view of "the proper social order" and the "right social growth." Our present society, to a large extent the product of his vision and order, is the tragic consequence of the false religion of Dewey and his co-conspirators.

Otto Scott returns to the Symposium a third time with his answer to the question. "What is Education?" His response. "We need to know the difference between reason and a rejection of God. We need to teach our children not to shun the world, because they will live in it all their lives, but to learn it and learn it so well they will not fall into its traps."

Pastor Ovid Need, Jr. of Linden, Indiana, USA, ends this section of the Symposium with a brief reminder and warning concerning education's purpose. It is not an end in itself. It is not intended, biblically, to create a superior man. It is, rather, God's instrument for the training of servants for the Kingdom, he argues.

Revolutions have often, perhaps usually, been launched in the name of material welfare for the poor and oppressed. *Ostensibly*, they have economic goals. We emphasize "ostensibly" because this is usually merely the "front" rationale for what is essentially a

power struggle. Nevertheless, because the revolutionary argument is so often couched in economic terms, it is important to Christian counter-revolutionaries or reconstructionists that we understand the proper economic dimensions of life. Our Symposium's next section attempts to add to this understanding.

Joseph R. McAuliffe of Tampa, Florida, USA, a pastor, business {7} adviser and political activist, opens the discussion with a study of the central Christian economic concept of stewardship. "Stewardship is an alien concept to twentieth-century Christians, even though it is the essence of what it means to be Christian," Rev. McAuliffe writes, "The Scriptures affirm that God, by virtue of creation [and redemption] is the possessor of all that exists, making humans totally accountable to God. Fallen man adamantly resists the biblical doctrine of creation, to the extent that he will take a leap of faith to embrace the irrational theory of evolution in order to escape the inevitable implications of stewardship that are inherent in the revelation of God as creator."

Investment adviser R. E. McMaster, Jr., of Marble Falls, Tex., USA, next gives us a case study in economic accountability in a report [from his newsletter, *The Reaper*] on the remarkable accomplishments of a banking system in the Basque region of Spain. From the successes of the bank of Mondragon and its related economic structures—which seek a middle road between extreme individualist capitalism and radical collectivism—Mr. McMaster draws some philosophical conclusions concerning mankind's key social needs of "love" and "money." "A healthy society collectively will be decentralized, architecturally and structurally, applying in the agriculturally based social order the contract—the covenant. The religious, governmental and economic nature of the contract establishes true equality amid desired inequality throughout society, based upon service first, followed by self-interest," he says. "It establishes the worth of the individual and establishes unity amid diversity. Self-interest, incentive, and risk-assumption are balanced off as by-products of duty and service, human need and security. People are seen as more important than things, as ultimate resources, because people determine the use of things. Thus, people are like-minded and this unity of love is established socially."

In the final essay in the economic section of the Symposium, J.

Daryl Charles confronts head-on the revolutionary myth that God is always “on the side of the poor.” Mr. Charles provides us with irrefutable evidence that when Scripture advocates the cause of the poor it is advocating those who consistently humble themselves to become men and women who are “on the side of God.” Poverty, in the biblical view, is not a socio-economic category but a description of a highly prized spiritual condition—emptiness of self and total submission to God’s will. To be sure, Scripture recognizes the needs of the truly dispossessed—the widow, the fatherless, those who, in God’s wisdom, have lost necessary earthly headship and the concomitant security it offers. But this group does not include the {8} indolent, the envious sluggard, the willfully dissipated, or those who lack dominion-oriented motivation—those who make up so large a part of the “poverty” class which is sentimentalized by our social “humanitarians.” Without a spiritual understanding of poverty, the author argues, “material want looses all Christian significance, degenerating either into aimless privation or a distorted view of faith.”

In the final section of this volume, we present a series of case histories of Christians who are effectuating change in our society at the grass-roots level. These are men and women who are taking personal faith and biblical understanding into their immediate spheres of influence—from the highest central echelons to local communities to broad national and international applications. Their ideas and activities are reported here as models for other believers who may or may not yet have recognized that Christian Reconstruction is the only kind of social change guaranteeing blessings and hope for mankind. “Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it.”

1. REVOLUTION

THE RELIGION OF REVOLUTION

Rousas John Rushdoony

Editor's Note: This essay was first published in pamphlet form in April 1965.

Part 1

Ancient man believed extensively that the universe developed out of chaos, and that chaos was accordingly the source of all creativity and power. Social regeneration required therefore the rebirth of chaos, and this the ancient festivals, of which Saturnalia is best known, sought to provide ritually. During a stated period of time, the festival, all laws of order were deliberately subverted. Property and marriage, for example, were rendered null and void. Lucian of Samosata, a second-century pagan writer, gives us an account of Saturnalia. For Lucian, the golden age preceded order; it was a time when "all men were good and all men were gold," when "slavery was not." The purpose of Saturnalia was to restore briefly that golden age through chaos and to revive contemporary society in its quest for the new golden age.

Lucian cited the laws of Saturnalia, which are a revealing index to social expectation. The first two laws from the First Table of Laws are especially telling.

All business, be it public or private, is forbidden during the feast days, save such as tends to sport and solace and {10} delight. Let none follow their avocations saving cooks and bakers.

All men shall be equal, slave and free, rich and poor, one with another.¹

1. H.W. and F.G. Fowler, translators. *The Works of Lucian of Samosata*, vol. IV, 114. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).

In older forms of the Saturnalia, a condemned prisoner became king during the festival and ruled, even to possessing the queen. As Caillois has noted, the festival was the suspension of time, law and order. "In every way, the primordial age must first be actualized. The festival is chaos rediscovered and newly created."² In some cultures today, the youth enter marriage only after a period of Saturnalia, a time of required chaos and promiscuity as the only true means to realizing "order."

In the Second Table of Laws as cited by Lucian of Samosata, the first law required that the rich, *before* Saturnalia began, shall record a tithe of their income, properties and clothing, which tithe must be disposed of on the eve of the festival. The rich must also pay the rents and debts of the poor. Gifts must be sent to the poor, and any rich man who, having given away liberally, failed to do so "with glad countenance ... be it known to him that he hath incurred that penalty of the sickle, though he himself hath sent all he should."³ The sickle, *atharme*, or magic knife, is an ancient symbol of magical power, whereby the "evil" ones are instantly dissolved or destroyed by the possessor of the sickle.⁴

In all such festivals, law, property, and order were offensive and had to be nullified. Sexual virtue also had to be deliberately overturned, wives being required to prostitute themselves, incest and other perversions also being demanded. In some cultures today, these customs continue, robbing, burning, pillaging, and raping becoming the law and order of the festival. In referring to one contemporary tribal culture, Caillois notes, "Ordinarily, these incestuous unions cause a chill of terror and abomination, and the guilty are condemned to the most vigorous punishments. Yet in the course of the festival, they are permitted and obligatory." They are, moreover, "ritualistic and holy."⁵

Why obligatory, and why holy? The answer is a religious one. If chaos is the origin of all being, then a religious revival requires

2. Roger Caillois. *Man and the Sacred*, 112. The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1959.

3. Lucian. *N*, 115f.

4. Grillot de Givry. *A Pictorial Anthology of Witchcraft, Alchemy and Magic*, 90. J.C. Locke, trans. (New Hyde Park, NY: University Books, 1958).

5. Caillois, 117.

a return to chaos, and the festival was and is the annual religious revival of such religious cultures. Christianity, by introducing faith in the sovereign God and His absolute law as the source of all creation, made true religious revival a return to God and to law. Instead of chaos, the characteristics of true renewal or revival are law and order, {11} and the respect of marriage, property, status, and authorities. For the religions of chaos, play (and escape from work) is the first step towards renewal. For the biblical religion, *faith* requires *law*, work and *order* as the instrument of renewal. The answer is thus clear-cut. If man worships chaos, then social renewal for him requires revolution, and ritualistic and necessary rebirth of chaos in order to remake man and society. In Lucian's day, the implications of Saturnalia were obvious. Cronosolon, the original chaos-god and law-giver of Saturnalia, had abdicated to Zeus, and therefore only briefly could there be the demanded "redistribution of property"⁶ and the hoped-for freedom from law. But the worshipers of chaos still hoped for the return of their golden age, when man would be beyond good and evil, beyond law, order, property, *and* religion.

But if man worships the biblical God, then the revolutionary faith in chaos is the epitome of evil, the essence of lawlessness, and, as the church fathers and theologians quickly saw it, the manifestation of antichrist. The struggle against these religions of chaos, in their many forms, is a central aspect of church history. This alien religion often entered the church in the form of various heresies, or survived in various carnivals, the Festival of Fools, the election of boy bishops, and, outside the church, in the satanic mass and other cultic practices. Very early, too, however, various groups arose, demanding during the late Medieval and early Reformation eras, a revolution against all morality, property, law, and order as the one means of regenerating the world.

The link between these ancient religions of chaos and the modern revolutionary movements is a very close and real one. The symbols themselves have remained constant throughout the centuries, among them being the ancient Phrygian cap of liberty (i.e., liberty from law, the liberty of chaos), which cap has found its way on to certain U.S. coins, the sickle or *atharme*, the hammer

6. Lucian, *IV*, 120.

(an ancient symbol of the destroying power of lightning on the one hand, and of antinomian sexual fertility on the other) and others as well.

We should not be surprised, therefore, that Marxists and other worshipers of chaos are *committed* to revolution even when the peaceful take-over of a country is possible. Revolution must then be created by mass liquidations and the destruction of all established law and order, including economic order. The “economics” of socialism (and welfare states) do not make sense because they are *not intended* to make sense. they are a defiance of the universe of God in the name of chaos. They invoke chaos as the highway to the golden age. If they fail, the guilt is not their’s. They blame the failure {12} on residual areas and pockets of religion, law, and order, of property and national loyalty. Their solution therefore is to increase the chaos. Since their universe is a universe of chaos, their golden age can only come through *planned chaos*. Hence, they deny the validity of the biblical God; they cannot accept a world of moral and economic law. Their golden age *requires* the triumph of man over religion, over morality, and over economics. The liberation of man requires the systematic violation and destruction of every law sphere.

This religious demand for the return of chaos is the essence of Henry Miller’s writings, stated over and over again. It was this return to chaos that Karl Marx demanded in “Private Property and Communism,” when he demanded “the positive abolition of every kind of alienation, i.e., the return of man from religion, the family, the state, etc., to his *human*, i.e., social existence.”⁷ Religion, the family, the state, property and law *alienate* man, in Marx’s philosophy, from the amoral, unconscious bliss of unalienated and collective man. It is this world of the ant-hill, beyond good and evil, beyond law and beyond consciousness, which Roderick Seidenberg calls for in *Post-Historic Man* (1950, 1957), and *Anatomy of the Future* (1961). This post-historic man will, like the ant, be without history because he is outside the category of self-consciousness, i.e., alienation from the collective whole.

Our politics today, therefore, is clearly the politics of Saturnalia,

7. Trans. by Rays Dunayevskaya in *Marx and Freedom*, 294 (New York: Bookman Associates, 1958).

in that it is in contempt of God and law and demands and assumes their mutual non-existence. The politics of Saturnalia does not recognize the validity of economic law because law has no place in its universe; the only ultimate category is chaos. In most countries, law today is what the courts declare it to be; law is thus totally immanent and man-made, and this is always a basic ingredient of chaos.

The prophet Isaiah, faced by similar devotees of the religion of chaos, who cloaked themselves in the garments of God, declared bluntly, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20). The pernicious religious roots of the politics of Saturnalia must be exposed lest we be all overwhelmed by chaos.

Part 2

Many readers of a prominent western American newspaper were startled one Sunday [26 years ago in 1964] to read a review of an "art film" showing in that city, Jean Genet's *Un Chant d'Amour* entirely {13} given over to depicting acts of homosexuality among convicts. This film, which the reviewer said was apparently "generously financed," could be described, not as an "art film," which it claimed to be, but only "as a stag film for homosexuals. Not by the wildest stretch of reasoning is it suitable for public screening." According to the reviewer, "the spectator is insultingly forced to play the role of a voyeur." But this critic's conclusion was entirely devoid of any moral criticism of Jean Genet's film version of portions of his novel, *Our Lady of Flowers*. All he could say was simply this. "It shows poor judgment and deplorable taste, which are, after all, incompatible with all the arts."⁸

Many were no doubt tempted to dismiss Genet and this film as examples of pornography which all civilized men will despise. But this is not easy to do. Genet's writings have received praise from many quarters, from *The New York Times* and other periodicals, and two of his books have been choices of a prominent American book club, catering ostensibly to intellectuals, The Reader's

8. Stanley Eichelbaum, "Critics Notebook," in *Show Time, San Francisco Examiner*, Sunday, December 6, 1964, p.3.

Subscription.⁹ Jean-Paul Sartre, existentialist philosopher, has written an admiring and verbose study of the man, entitled *Saint Genet*, a book which has received the praise of the *Boston Globe*, Harper's, Atlantic, the *Chicago Daily News*, The London Times, and *Newsweek*. The title makes us pause. Who is this man called *saint* by an atheistic philosopher? The Readers' Subscription, in promoting Genet's books, identifies him as a pornographer and homosexual, "a thief, deserter, beggar, convict, male prostitute" and now a writer on these things. *Time* has commented that "Genet is a matchless, unholy trinity" of scatology, pornography, and the legitimate study of evil. "Besides him, Henry Miller is but a cheerfully smutty college sophomore, Sade a dilettante aristocrat of eccentric habits, Gide a genteel old lady sedately cultivating nightshade in her kitchen garden."¹⁰ How then is Genet a saint? Ervin A. Glikes speaks of Genet's desire to be a saint.

"Saintliness" is a word Genet uses in all seriousness, but, of course, perversely. And yet he too means a dying to this world and rebirth to a better one—of his own making. Saintliness, for Genet, is the total surrender to beauty, and the greatest beauty consists in the creation of erotic fantasies so perfectly realized by a supreme effort of the will and imagination, and of the writer's craft, that they succeed in converting every minus in the world's calculus to a glowing plus in his own.¹¹

To be a saint, {14} in this definition, means to die first of all to the world of God and to godly law and society and then to be "reborn" into a world of evil with a total dedication to it, to an asceticism of evil in which all goodness and righteousness are wholly renounced and forsaken. According to Sartre, "The pure will to Evil... represents spirituality. The mind, which has been freed, here makes contact with itself, gives itself rules, confers upon the world its status."¹² The non-biblical and scholastic doctrine that "Sin is the gaping void of God" is affirmed; evil is seen as non-being. To affirm this non-

9. See *The Griffin*, vol. 12, no. 13, and vol. 13, no. 11.

10. Cited in *The Griffin*, vol. 12, no. 13.

11. Erwin A. Glikes, 'A Perverse Kind of Saintliness,' in *The Griffin*, vol. 13, no. 11.

12. Jean-Pau, Sartre. *Saint Genet, Actor and Martyr*, 168 (New York: Mentor Books, 1964).

being is to negate being, God (in terms of this school of thought), and to gain “freedom.” “Unless one is a god, one cannot make oneself happy without the help of the universe; to make oneself unhappy, one needs only oneself.” Evil is thus freedom; it means for Genet “to acquire the autonomy of his will.”¹³ His sacredness and holiness is this: “he does Evil for Evil’s sake, without a reason, haughtily, by the simple, divine decree of His Will.”¹⁴ Evil means freedom from God, so that Genet declares, “I went to theft as to a liberation.”¹⁵ According to Sartre, “Translated into the language of Evil, Good is only an illusion; Evil is a Nothingness which arises upon the ruins of Good.”¹⁶ This means a war against God and His law, and against the very idea of God. As Spier has summarized it, for Sartre, “Real freedom is the absolute arbitrariness of man. Man is outside of law and in his deeds only reckons with himself. True responsibility is to be responsible to oneself and to no one else.”¹⁷ The goal is chaos. “Thus my neighbor is for me the devil, and life in social relations with others is similar to the fall into sin.” No relationship or obligation to any other person can be permitted to limit one’s anarchic freedom.¹⁸ Man becomes his own god and recognizes no law or being in the universe other than himself. His goal becomes living beyond good and evil, beyond law and order, beyond any structure or standard which can inhibit or judge him. The “passion of man is the reverse of that of Christ, for man loses himself as man in order that God may be born. But the idea of god is contradictory and we lose ourselves in vain. Man is a useless passion.”¹⁹ This is clearly and openly a philosophy of chaos and of nihilism which works towards the mass destruction of civilization, of all law and order, in the name of “freedom.”

It works, moreover, for *equality*, because absolute equality means

13. *Ibid.*, 175.

14. *Ibid.*, 261.

15. *Ibid.*, 435.

16. *Ibid.*, 669.

17. J.M. Spier. *Christianity and Existentialism*, 65 (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1953).

18. *Ibid.*, 66.

19. Jean-Paul Sartre. *Being and Nothingness, An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*, 615 (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956).

that right and wrong are all the same, superior and inferior are abolished, freedom and slavery are merely semantic quibblings, and no standard outside of man can be imposed upon him. This is the crusade of modern revolutions: Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality. It is liberty from law into chaos, and total equality which results in the {15} rejection of all standards, tests, and criteria, and brotherhood or fraternity in this world without God, law, or meaning. This was the goal of the French Revolution.²⁰ It is the goal of The Communist Manifesto, and of Communist, Socialist, neo-orthodox, and existentialist philosophies. It is the goal of legal efforts to remove not only references to God from all civil life, but also to legalize the use of marijuana as a “constitutional right.”²¹ It is the goal of the increasingly successful efforts to destroy laws against pornography and subversion. And it is a major aspect of the “civil rights” movement.

Norman Mailer has pointed out that the modern outsider to God and law finds his hero in the Negro, whom he sees as “a natural social adventurer sworn against respectability, conformity, dullness, and emotional timidity.”²² The modern “white Negro” is a man who imagines the Negro to be his ideal man, a natural anarchist and nihilist, and therefore a social hero. Moreover, to gain the acceptance of the Negro, irrespective of his character, is to gain a victory against law and standards in the name of equality.

There is indication already of another “civil rights” offensive as a next step after the Negro: “the homosexual may be partly replacing the Negro as an object of liberal solicitude and the prime test of liberal tolerance.”²³ If there is no God and no divinely ordained law, then not only does perversion have equal rights with morality, but actually truer rights, because Christian morality is seen as an imposition on and a dehumanization of man, whereas perversion

20. See Nesta H. Webster. *The French Revolution, A Study in Democracy* (London: Constable, 1921).

21. See, for the court action started, *Marijuana Puff-In*, and *The LaGuardia Report, Chap. 1*, In the Supreme Court of California, In re Lowell F. Eggemeier, Petitioner. San Francisco. James R. White III, 1964.

22. Cesar Grana. *Bohemian versus Bourgeois*, 180 (New York: Basic Books, 1964).

23. Dennis H. Wrong. ‘Homosexuality in America,’ in *New Society*, no. 29, June 27, 1963, 19.

is an act of liberty and autonomy for this school of thought.

This new morality or amorality of chaos was advocated by the Kinsey report. In his study of women, Kinsey and his associates advocated premarital sexual freedom for girls as a means to post-marital sexual happiness and as important in developing the girl's total social relationships.²⁴ Adults endanger the free and happy development of children by instilling in them inhibitions and prohibitions which lead to a guilt reaction. "When there are long years of abstinence and restraint, and an avoidance of physical contacts and emotional responses before marriage, acquired inhibitions may do such damage to the capacity to respond that it may take some years to get rid of them after marriage, if indeed they are ever dissipated."²⁵ In cases involving molestation of young girls by adult men, Kinsey held that the real damage was done by cultural conditioning. The child is "constantly warned" by adults, parents and teachers against strange men, and as a result they are "emotionally upset or frightened by their contacts with adults," although Kinsey stated that twenty percent of such cases "felt that their {16} pre-adolescent experience had contributed favorably to their later socio-sexual development." The fright of the 80 percent Kinsey rated "nearer the level that children will show when they see insects, spiders, or other objects against which they have been adversely conditioned. If a child were not culturally conditioned, it is doubtful if it would be disturbed by sexual approaches of the sort which had usually been involved in these histories." The real offender is not the adult child molester but the inhibiting parent and society with their moral "thou shalt nots."

Some of the more experienced students of juvenile problems have come to believe that the emotional reactions of the parents, police officers, and other adults who discover that the child has had such a contact, may disturb the child more seriously than the sexual contacts themselves. The current hysteria over sex offenders may very well have serious effects on the ability of many of these children to work out sexual adjustments some years later in their

24. Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardel, B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, Pau, Gebhard, etc.: *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*, 115, 327f. (Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders, 1953).

25. *Ibid.*, 330.

marriages.²⁶

Kinsey was very definitely one of these “more experienced students” for whom the real criminal was the advocate of Christian morality. The mental and spiritual damage is done by those moralists, not by the “sex offender.” As for physical damage to the child, this, Kinsey said, was “exceedingly small.” In 4,441 cases, he found “only one clear-cut case of serious injury done to the child, and a very few instances of vaginal bleeding which, however, did not appear to do any appreciable damage.”²⁷ For Kinsey, the substantial damage, therefore, has come from moral teaching!

Kinsey declared there were six forms of natural or normal sexual “outlets”: homosexuality, heterosexuality, animal contacts, petting, masturbation, and nocturnal emissions; and accordingly, as a psychiatrist, he viewed them in terms of “total equality.” Moreover, since the publication of Kinsey’s first volume on sex, the increased prevalence of homosexuality “can be directly traced to Kinsey.”²⁸

Ugly and revolting as this subject is, it cannot be avoided. There is at present a major legal, legislative, literary and studied assault on biblical morality. It is, moreover, not only heavily promoted by the left, but it is also financed by major foundations. The Kinsey studies have been financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, and Wormser has cited their “special responsibility” for the Kinsey reports.²⁹

But an even more central responsibility rests on the churches, which have espoused a new theology and a new morality. Bishop John Robinson’s *Honest to God*, which is a popularization of Paul Tillich’s theology, is well known. Robinson believes that “the only intrinsic evil is lack of love,” because “*nothing else* makes a thing right or wrong.” Any sexual act is valid, in or out of marriage, heterosexual or homosexual, as long as *love* prevails,

26. *Ibid.*, 121.

27. *Ibid.*, 122.

28. Edmund Bergler, M.D.. *Counterfeit-Sex. Homosexuality, Impotence, Frigidity*, viii-x (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1958. second edition, enlarged.

29. Rene A. Wormser. *Foundations. Their Power and Influence*, 100ff, 321ff (New York: Devin-Adair, 1958.

“For nothing can of itself be labeled as ‘wrong.’”³⁰ When neo-orthodox churchmen speak of “the freedom of God,” they mean that their god (who is non-existent to begin with, being an idea and a value) is not bound by any moral law in his own being nor any eternal decree. Instead of a fixed law and a fixed nature, he has total freedom to be the reverse tomorrow of what he is today. This means that there is no absolute law in God’s being other than total freedom, and, accordingly, there is no absolute law for man other than total freedom. This, of course, is exactly what the anarchist cults of chaos are teaching as well. It is also the same as the ancient cult of Bacchanalia, which swept Rome during the Second Punic War (218–20, BC), gaining almost half the population and aspiring to total power. The cult was extensively involved, not only in the most flagrant of sexual crimes, but in illegal political activities. “The holiest article of their faith was to think nothing a crime.”³¹ Over and over again, through the centuries, esoteric cults and revolutionary movements have affirmed this same doctrine of “liberty.” One occultist, in opposing the role of Masonry in the French Revolution, spoke of their creed of liberty, fraternity, and equality as “liberty for envyings, equality in degradation, fraternity for destruction.”³² During the Russian Revolution, the Christian framework of the state was overthrown, as well as Christian law, morality, and marriage. Women were nationalized and made the common sexual property of all card-carrying working men, and the family was abolished. Only the radical decline in the birth-rate, wide-spread social disorder, and the breakdown of society led to a state-controlled return to family life some years later, in legislation between 1936 and 1944.³³

All this, in brief, is the doctrine of the ancient church and religion of antichrist, whose first temporary recruits were gained in the Garden of Eden, when Adam and Eve succumbed to the satanic

30. John A.T. Robinson. *Honest to God*, 118f (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963).

31. Otto Kiefer. *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*, 120 (New York: Dutton, 1935).

32. Eliphas Levi. *Histoire de la Magic*, 407, cited in Nesta H. Webster. *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, 164f. (Hawthorne, CA: Omni, 1964), 8th edition.

33. Carle C. Zimmerman and Lucius F. Cervantes, S.J.. *Marriage and the Family*, 524–530 (Chicago, IL: Regnery, 1956).

temptation, “Ye shall be as gods (or God), knowing good and evil” (Genesis 3:5). To be as gods, this was the temptation. every man his own law-maker and a total law unto himself, determining for himself what is good and evil. Whatever this man-god declares to be good *for him* is therefore good because he *knows* it is good in terms of the absolute law of his will. The only true morality is thus self-willed morality, what the individual wants. If any god or gods exist, they cannot have any advantage over men. their law is no more binding [18] than that of any other being in the universe.

As a result, pseudo-Christianity, when patterned after this first principle of the church of antichrist, must deny that there is any fundamental division among men in terms of God’s absolute law. John Dewey denied any value to supernatural, orthodox Christianity because it is basically and radically anti-democratic. The God of Scripture has an eternal and unchanging law in terms of which men are saved or lost. Christianity thus divides men into “the saved and the lost” and is thereby committed to a “spiritual aristocracy.” Dewey declared, “I cannot understand how any realization of the democratic ideal as a vital moral and spiritual ideal in human affairs is possible without surrender of the conception of the basic division to which supernatural Christianity is committed.”³⁴ In John Dewey’s system, God is not permitted to discriminate between good and evil, the teacher between the passing and the failing, and society between one class of men and another. All must be one in a total democracy in which the individual is nothing apart from society.

This same faith underlies the religion of the brotherhood of man. The Bible teaches the separation of men in terms of faith. But these new self-styled “constructive” voices in the church want the total unity of man irrespective of faith. Thus, one ostensibly “Reformed” professor sees true Calvinism as a belief that we “constitute one family,” and are “the universal ‘neighborhood’ of man.” He declares, “I may no more *choose my* neighbor than I choose myself; my task is to *recognize*, not discriminate!”³⁵ If this

34. John Dewey. *A Common Faith*, 51f. New Haven. Yale University Press, 1934.

35. L.D.K.. ‘Foundation for Calvinistic Social Philosophy,’ in *The Reformed Journal*, March 1964, 4.

be true, then Christ was certainly in error in discriminating against the Pharisees rather than merely recognizing and accepting them, and Calvin and Luther erred in their separation from Rome.

Our task is “to *recognize*, not discriminate!” Many voices are insistent on this. How far do some go in this regard? The answer is. all the way. The constitution of the Mattachine Society of Washington clearly declares that it means recognizing homosexuals. Its purpose is “To secure for homosexuals the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as proclaimed for all men by the Declaration of Independence; and to secure for homosexuals the basic right and liberties established by the word and spirit of the Constitution of the United States. to equalize the status and position of the homosexual with those of the heterosexual by achieving equality under law, equality of opportunity, equality in the society of his fellow men, and by eliminating adverse prejudice, both private and official.” The purpose also is “to secure for the homosexual the right, as a human being, to develop and achieve his full potential and dignity.”³⁶ This {19} homosexual organization identified itself as a “civil liberties organization” defending “a minority.”³⁷ Since human beings have, in the humanistic perspective, rights apart from God’s word and law, they and their rights are beyond law, and every attempt to impose a moral requirement on these “minority” groups is a “violation” of civil liberties. “Our society does not allow” homosexuals their “right as human beings to develop and achieve their full potential” because of its laws and “prejudices” against homosexuality, and the society is “trying to dispel the public’s irrational prejudice so they can do this.”³⁸ Christian morality is thus seen as “irrational prejudice” which denies *recognition* to fellow human beings. Since no recognition is granted to biblical faith and law, it is possible for the representative of this “civil rights” movement to hold that “homosexuality is neither a sickness, a disease, a neurosis, a psychosis, a disorder, a defect, or other disturbance, but merely a matter of an inclination of a significantly large number of citizens.” We must recognize or

36. *Amending District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act, Hearings on H.R. 5990*, 13, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

37. *Ibid.*, 22.

38. *Ibid.*, 34.

take people as *they are*:

...*in* terms of our basic purpose, we are no more interested in changing homosexual-heterosexuality than B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League is interested in solving the problem of anti-semitism by conversion of just two Christians.

We start off by saying here we have these two people. They are citizens and human beings, and they are entitled to, although they presently do not have, all of their rights and we are trying to work for the achievement of those.

The NAACP does not try to see what can be done about bleaching the Negro.³⁹ In spite of the condemnation of homosexuality by the Bible and the death penalty required for its practice (Deut. 23:17, Lev. 18:22, 20:33, etc.), it is actually claimed by a minister that homosexuality and Christianity “are not inconsistent with each other,” a position also held by other churchmen.⁴⁰ When Congressman Dowdy quoted Scripture to disprove the statements made before a congressional committee regarding the Bible and homosexuality, the president of the Mattachine Society of Washington, Franklin E. Kameny, who had brought the subject up, objected. “This is a matter of theology. I feel that a theological discussion on the part of a member of Congress in his capacity is grossly improper under the first amendment to the Constitution.”⁴¹ Mr. Kameny declared that moral legislation was basically illegal. “Matters of morality and immorality are matters of personal opinion and individual religious belief and under the First Amendment to the Constitution the Federal {20} Government is prohibited from interceding in them as such.”⁴² As long as there is free consent, no act should be illegal, Kameny held. Prostitution is simply free enterprise, and strictly a private affair, not a subject for legislation.⁴³ Homosexuality is no more “unnatural” than eating cooked food and wearing clothing, according to an

39. *Ibid.*, 35.

40. *Ibid.*, 60ff.

41. *Ibid.*, 62.

42. *Ibid.*, 68f.

43. *Ibid.*, 73.

Anglican divine.⁴⁴ An American Civil Liberties Union attorney, Monroe H. Freedman, also appeared before the House committee, as chairman of the Freedom of Communications Committee, because he was concerned with the “interference with ... freedom of speech, freedom of association” current against “Mr. Kameny’s groups” by prevailing laws.⁴⁵

Unfortunately, the principles of the Mattachine Society are increasingly becoming the principles of the courts. There is good reason for this. *All law is inescapably a reflection of morality*, and all morality is an expression of a religious faith. Laws against murder and adultery represent moral judgments that these acts are evil, and these judgments are aspects of an religious law rather than in contempt of it. Law is always inescapably religious. Modern “law” increasingly represents the new establishment religion of many courts. Its basic creed is easily summarized.

1. *Because God does not exist, all is permissible.*
2. *Because God does not exist, man is or can become god.*
3. *Because man is ultimate and a god, he cannot be coerced or forced into a morality imposed by a non-humanistic faith.*
4. *Therefore, man must not be converted; he must be **recognized** in his humanistic faith, and Christians must be educated into this recognition.*
5. *Therefore, law must serve man; man and society are not under law but over law.*
6. *Therefore, the established religion of the state is and must be humanism, that **common faith** of which all men as men are members without any requirement other than being men. and this is **democracy**; it is fraternity, equality, and true liberty.*

John Dewey’s *A Common Faith* called precisely for a common faith, one which by definition could exclude no man—except the orthodox Christian. The humanists and occultists of our time

44. *Ibid.*, 85.

45. *Ibid.*, 107.

are working to create that faith and the world of that faith. Foster Bailey believes it is dawning. “we are passing rapidly into another sign, the sign of Aquarius,” of the Water-Carrier and bringer of true cleansing {21} and purification.⁴⁶ But the “time” of Aquarius is also to be a flood of destruction against orthodox Christianity. Like the demonic revolutionists of Dostoevsky’s *The Possessed*, these men begin with unlimited freedom for man to do as he pleases and end with the unlimited despotism of the state and total slavery. With their cult of chaos, they seek total destruction for total good, and they end in their own destruction. “For God is not mocked. for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap” (Gal. 6:7)

Part 3

In a novel by Lawrence Durrell, *Black Book*, we read, “Why are we afraid of becoming insects? I can imagine no lovelier goal. The streets of Paradise are not more lovely then the highways of the ant heap ... Let the hive take my responsibilities. I am weary of them.”⁴⁷ This total regimentation and dehumanization of the ant heap is the goal of modern anti-Christian man. He dreams of a total man-made order which every day more nearly resembles total chaos. And, as we have seen, this is necessarily so, because, when chaos is made ultimate and chaos is the source of all life and order, then chaos will ultimately govern all things. Chaos becomes the inescapable god who swallows all his creatures and allows for no escape.

A sophisticated modern development of the ancient chaos cult is the theory of evolution, which is the religion of modern scientists.⁴⁸ All things supposedly developed out of an original chaos of being, and the process of evolution is the assumption of a continuous act of chaos against present order. The current idea of evolution by mutations is held in the face of the known fact that mutations are at least almost all deleterious and destructive.

46. Foster Bailey. *The Spirit of Masonry*, 69f. (Tunbridge Wells, Kent, England: Lucas Press, 1957).

47. Lawrence Durrell. *The Black Book*, 215f (New York: Dutton, 1960).

48. See John C. Whitcomb Jr. and Henry M. Morris. *The Genesis Flood*, 1961, 1964; and Henry M. Morris. *The Twilight of Evolution*, 1964; both published by Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, PA.

More basic, the evolutionist sees nature and man and all being as one continuous whole; there is no supernatural and no distinction between created being, and uncreated being, God. Evolutionists speak of their universe as *open*, i.e., evolving, but their universe is actually *closed* and self-sufficient. The closed universe means that the life of man is wholly comprehended, as are all things, within the order of nature, since nothing transcends nature. As a result ultimate authority and proximate authority are made one. There is no law beyond man and nature, and, since man and nature are both evolving, there is no fixed or eternal law, no absolute right and wrong. There is thus for the evolutionist no supreme court of appeal to God against evil, no power in law or in righteousness, no unchanging revelation on which to stand. There is simply evolution, and evolution means *change*. {22} Change thus becomes man's hope and salvation. Earlier evolutionists saw change as slow and gradual, but, gradually, it came to be "recognized" that man could himself promote change and thus he could further evolution. This guided change is, in every area, revolutionary action, a deliberate disruption of order designed to produce a superior order. It is the ancient use of chaos as the means to true order. The evolutionist looks to chaos as the Christian looks to God. Since the evolutionist, as scientific planner, does not believe in any absolute right or wrong, there is nothing except old "prejudices" to prevent him from using man experimentally and without restraint as test animal in creating or evolving his scientific social order. Man is thus his guinea pig and tool towards the "brave new world" of science. The more remote men of such science become from Christian faith and morality, the bolder they will be in their "scientific socialism." And it is this freedom from God and morality and this evolutionary belief which constitutes the "science" of Marx's "scientific socialism."

The Christian places his hope in the saving power of Jesus Christ and the infallible word of God, the Bible. The evolutionist places his hope in revolutionary change as the effectual power to new life and order. The Christian cannot afford to compromise at this point. To diminish the sovereignty of God in creation at any point is to diminish His sovereignty in redemption, providence, predestination, and regeneration. To be created in God's image means that man is responsible to God, not to the state. It means

that man is primarily and essentially under authority, the authority of God's law, and man cannot therefore be the state's creature or slave. The state, like man, must be under God's law. For the evolutionist, there is no law beyond the law of the state; man is the only source of law, and the elite man is the best voice of that human law, which is tyranny. Man, created in God's image, is fallen. The basis of man's fall is his original sin, trying to be as God, every man his own god; this means a world of anarchy, of many conflicting ultimate wills. Man has tried to justify his sin from the beginning by positing a world of anarchy, of chance and chaos, to avoid God's voice. But this fallen man cannot escape God's judgment nor can he save himself. He can be redeemed and can come to fulfillment only as he is recreated by Jesus Christ, the true man and the true image of God. The closed world of the evolutionist means the death of law and of liberty. It leaves man no ground of appeal against tyranny. Instead of man, created in the image of God, being able to appeal to the word of God as the law of his being, it leaves man created in the image of chaos and only able to appeal to {23} chaos as his hope of redemption. The question, therefore, is not an academic or an abstract one. The liberty and destiny of man is at stake. It is either the savage and destructive forces of man-made and man-invoked chaos or "the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Romans 8:21), a liberty which is godly man's immortal destiny and his present privilege.

THE SHAPE OF EVENTS [OUR REVOLUTION]

Otto Scott

Originally delivered as an address to the fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Committee for Monetary Research and Education in 1987. It has been updated in minor respects for inclusion in this symposium.

Some time ago, *The Wall Street Journal* editorialized about a confrontation between Congress and the Executive Branch. Observing that the president is elected by all the people and is the only official constitutionally authorized to conduct foreign policy, the *Journal* described the confrontation as whether or not the president [at that time, Ronald Reagan] had violated the 1947 National Securities Act or the Boland Amendment attached to an appropriations bill in 1983.

In the course of this description, the *Journal* wondered whether the results of the prior presidential election would be overturned in favor of the foreign policy of Clayborn Pell. Senator Pell, you will recall, was against resistance to Communism. Later in the editorial, the *Journal* wondered how we can arrive at a consensus between what it called “the wholly incompatible view of the world and U.S. security by such politicians as Senators Pell, Kerry, Mikulski and Dodd? So long as this minority exercises a veto within its own party,” the *Journal* continued, “the tension will persist.”

Unfortunately, this presentation, as clear as it is, does not do justice to the situation. For what is underway adds up to more than a struggle between two political parties holding the same basic beliefs. It adds up to another stage in what is, and has been, a revolutionary {26} process.

Some may dispute this, because Dan Rather has not appeared on the *Six O'clock News* to inform the nation that a revolution is underway. Neither has any similar announcement been made by any other television commentators, professors, experts, specialists or politicians. But revolutions do not announce themselves prematurely, that would be to alert the opposition. They arrive unheralded, without warning. But they do arrive—at the end of certain phases that have now been repeated often enough to be defined.

The final stage in all revolutions is an assault against the Executive. This has taken various forms.

In France in the 1790s, during the great proto-typical secular revolution of modern times, the assault against the Executive was mounted from inside the Legislature. That final stage began when the Estates General were transformed into a General Assembly—a more radical body. The legislators in the Assembly launched a series of “inquiries”—miniature trials, so to speak—against the Crown, the Nobility, the Clergy and, ultimately, even centrist members of the Assembly itself. These proceedings were noisily supported by *cliques* in the Assembly gallery, by partisans parading in the streets, by demonstrators and rioters, and by a radical press. This revolutionary chorus created the impression that all France was on the rim of a volcano.

As the Left—the Jacobins—expanded their influence within the Assembly, they rewrote the Constitution, obtained its ratification and held elections in which they triumphed. Then their “inquiries” took on a new and sinister significance. The Courts of France, which had assisted the revolution to reduce the powers of the Crown, were reduced to impotence, together with all the other institutions of the *ancien regime*. By then the guillotine was in operation; Louis XVI and his Queen were sent to their deaths; an entire class was murdered.

I cite this great precedent in part to draw your attention to the time span involved. For it was only three years after the Estates General were first convened, until the time of the guillotine. That's not very long.

The Russian example is closer in terms of time. As you know, the Czar abdicated in March 1917. The Provisional Government that replaced the Czar had no specific chief executive. It consisted

largely of a Legislature that was, at first, headed by monarchists. They looked for a new Czar, but the man they chose refused to serve. Being liberals, they also invited the Social Democrats to serve with them in the Duma. And in true Leftist fashion, the Social Democrats {27} took control, and issued a call for all Leftists to join in creating a new government. Their slogan was one still in vogue among the credulous. “No *enemies on the Left*.”

Their call reached Trotsky in New York and Stalin in exile and Lenin in Zurich. It also reached the ears of the German General Staff, which provided 50 million gold marks to Lenin & Company. The Bolsheviks then proceeded to buy 47 newspapers—and guns. This flood of money in the midst of shortages also enabled the Bolsheviks to hire an army. In October, 1917, the Bolsheviks seized the Duma by force, sent the Social Democrats into flight or into prison, and launched the Red Terror—which has not yet ceased. Once again the time span is significant. From the time the Czar abdicated until the October coup d'état was about eight months. Eight months!

The final stage of the German Revolution reveals a similar pattern. As usual, historians bicker over the initiating date. One school chooses Bismarck and his adoption of Socialistic programs which were continued until World War I. Another school dates the beginning with the post-World War I period after the Kaiser abdicated and a new Social Democratic government took office under a new Constitution. For the sake of brevity, let's start with the Twenties. The Social Democrats, as usual, governed with self-righteous rhetoric and a fine Constitution—which they proceeded to ignore. They ruled largely by emergency decrees. But although they intervened in the economy, they did not use overt force. That arrived with the Nazis, whose efficiency made the Bolsheviks seem crude. Hitler was made chancellor on January 30, 1933. A month later, on February 28, 1933, he was granted life and death power over everyone in Germany. His Terror started, therefore, in four weeks.

More examples could be cited, but the point is clear. These great revolutions achieved their final triumphs by obtaining control of the Legislature.

Obviously, I am talking only about the final stage. A very important question is, “What were the preceding stages in these

rises to power?” Inherent in the answer to that question lies at least part of the reason why so many Americans appear so confused before so repetitive a phenomenon.

Our historians and commentators have told us, over and again, that revolutions are the result of long-standing injustice and poverty. They have described revolutions as inevitable, and they argue that in many respects revolutions are pathways to progress. At this moment, they are encouraging revolution in South Africa, as a means of improving that society. {28} But when revolution appeared in France, that nation was the richest in the world. France had the largest land mass and the greatest number of people in all Europe. England had a population of 5 million, the United States had 3 million—and France had 25 million. Its industries were the largest, it had the greatest number of wealthy and middle class persons; its language was preferred for diplomacy, art, letters and science; it had more intellectuals than any other nation, more novels, more theater—and more license. Behavior under Louis XVI was unbridled. Paris, Marseilles and other French cities harbored sex clubs, cults, occult fashions, homosexual costume balls, wild theater and newspapers that combined pornography and radical politics. Adultery in the middle and upper classes was the mode and not a whim; the laws against insulting the Crown or blaspheming Christianity were dead letters. Poverty was at the lowest level in French history, though it existed.

How did revolution occur in so rich a society? We can argue about Why, but How is a matter of record. The government of France rose under the Sun King, Louis XIV, and then fell in terms of stability, because the Sun King drained the Treasury with his wars and his extravagances. His successor listened to John Law, whose paper money experiment ruined thousands of prosperous families. Then more extravagances under Louis XV. Finally, when Louis XVI arrived, France had lost its North American colony and spent its last reserves helping the Americans against Britain. Saddled with an enormous deficit, the French government could no longer pay the interest on its bonds. The banks of Switzerland and Amsterdam closed against Paris.

In that extremity, the financial experts told the King that there was only one solution. raise taxes. That was why the Estates General were summoned (in the name of Tax Reform), and where

most historians date the start of the French Revolution.

Let's add some social and intellectual factors. Economics cannot be separated from the body politic or the social context in which commerce and government function. There is nothing abstract about real life; it does not exist in sections. At about the same time that the long reign of Louis XIV succeeded in boring all France, Voltaire launched his satires—his ridicules of the Christian religion, French manners and morals, French history and tradition: the French culture. Voltaire's success not only inspired an army of imitators; it launched a decades-long fashion. Eventually the fashion spawned Rousseau, who argued that man is good, and society is bad. If anyone did anything wrong, it was the fault of the System. {29} There would not have been a revolution in France if its intellectuals had not turned against French history, traditions, leaders and institutions. It was that onslaught which portrayed French patriotism as foolish, backward and reactionary.

Solzhenitsyn said, "*To destroy a people, you must first sever their roots.*" He was talking about a nation's memory, its history. The French intellectuals came to accept Voltaire's description of their history as a record of criminality. As their self-respect waned, French morals loosened. Slander became another term for journalism. The underground press combined pornography and radicalism. It invented scurrilous lies about prominent persons. Marie Antoinette was actually running a soup kitchen in Paris when a newspaper reported her as having said, "*Let them eat cake.*" When I was a boy, American school teachers were still teaching that fable as a fact.

Without the alienation of the intellectuals, there could not have been a revolution. This was equally true in Russia. For at least seventy years, the Russian *intelligentsia* argued against the Czar, the Church, the institutions and the culture of Russia. Dostoyevsky saw where this would lead even more clearly than Edmund Burke had analyzed the French Revolution, for Dostoyevsky recognized spiritual values. Men who abandon God are capable of every evil, for to such men, evil loses its taint—and its guilt.

German Social Democrats came to power in the Twenties, after the German defeat in World War I. They had no affection for the vanquished Kaiser and the traditions of Germany—quite the contrary. Newspapers, art and the theater assaulted German

traditions in wholesale fashion. The artist George Grosz portrayed Germans as swine. Later, as a refugee in the United States, he changed his style. Some of his admirers were surprised. “*You don’t understand,*” he told them. He had learned that hate begets hate.

Understanding, on any level, is difficult to achieve. Here in the United States, we have a population that combines personal commitment with intellectual detachment, and even disbelief. We have people who work hard, but refuse to think; refuse to add things up. There is a widespread conviction that nothing has a larger meaning.

In the face of a continuing trashing of this nation by its intellectuals, such an attitude is more than myopic. It is intellectually perverse. Every pre-revolutionary symptom of Paris in the 1780s and Leningrad in 1910 and Berlin in the Twenties is among us today. the foreign agents; the mysteriously funded, unsettling publications; the cults and the homosexual clubs; the demonstrations and riots; the {30} disorders; the demagogues; the international intrigues and the helpless bourgeoisie; the bankrupt government and Utopians talking about a new Constitution, while the Left mounts an assault on the Executive from the bastion of the Legislature.

All that separates us from Paris, 1789, and Berlin, 1930, is a financial debacle. Does anyone doubt that it is coming? If so, I have yet to meet that person. In the period from 1977 to 1981, the United States lost half its steel production, more than half its non-ferrous metal production, a fifth of its automobile production, more than half its machine tool production, and a tripling of its imports from \$120 billion to \$380 billion a year. And that was nine years ago.

Since then the pace of our deindustrialization has quickened. Meanwhile the Federal Reserve Bank continues to pump paper money into the economy as though the laws of currency degradation have been abolished. We have a huge deficit, and have become the world’s largest debtor nation at a time when nations which are in debt to us are in the process of organizing international defaults.

Now the revolution has reached Congress. Congressional demagogues coordinate their arguments with the radical Left in the media, in universities and with “social activist” groups. In the

space of a single year, this chorus pushed our government into making an enemy of South Africa, although we are dependent on that nation for essential minerals without which our industries and military cannot survive. Despite warnings from the Office of Strategic Resources, both the President and Congress have chosen to place severe sanctions against that strategically important nation. Not to expect retaliation from South Africa would, in my opinion, amount to relying upon people whom we have injured not to injure us. So far as I know, only this nation is that unworldly or masochistic.

When we combine a looming industrial crisis with a financial crisis, we anticipate the worst situation in our history. For when the Great Depression arrived, we had no huge international enemy openly dedicated to our downfall. Some have predicted that mobs will surge through the streets. But they do that today. Fleets of hired buses converge on the Capitol; entire hotels are rented; thousands of meals supplied from unidentified sources to promote the revolution. But once the revolution succeeds, a great fear will descend, for the revolution will be armed against disorder.

There are several plausible points at which we can date the onset of Our Revolution. We can begin with the rise of authoritarian Socialists among our intellectuals in the 1870s; or we can start with the rise of anarchists, rioters and bomb-throwers in the years before {31} World War I; or we can start with the wartime dictatorship of Woodrow Wilson when men like Eugene Debs were thrown into prison for speaking against the war; or we can start with the pro-Communist writers and journalists of the Twenties and Thirties; or we can start with the expansion of governmental authority under the New Deal; or we can start with the post-World War II rush to lock up the nation by various agencies and bureaucrats. No matter where we start, it will add up to the fact that the American government today is nothing like the one founded in Philadelphia, nor is it headed by men who believe in those early principles.

The income tax made it legal to treat citizens unequally, and now groups are treated unequally in Court. The various regulations over every aspect of human activity have created a licensing jungle that leaves virtually no function unregulated. Bank and medical records are no longer private. Anything that requires the use of money must be recorded. A move is underway to create a cashless

society—because cash makes men free—and freedom is out of fashion.

We have seen the rise of regulatory agencies that combine the three functions of government that the Founding Fathers sought to keep forever separate. These agencies make rules that have the force of law, administer those rules, and sit in judgment over those who break those rules. Appeals to the courts are only accepted after all agency labyrinths have been traversed, after considerable time and expense. We have seen the appearance of Executive Orders that have the force of law, issued by the Executive Branch, *sans* vote, *sans* discussion. Some of these authorize the Executive, in the event of a crisis, to take control of every individual and institution in the land. These orders authorize the Executive to define the emergency.

Do not be deceived by the weakness of recent presidents. Such power will remain inert only until a strong man awakens them. Like the decrees of the Weimar Republic, they are available to enslave us. As to the constitutionality of either the agencies or the Executive Orders, the courts have chosen to look away. Therefore all these rules and regulations, created outside the control of the people sit, like so many weapons in an arsenal of tyranny, available to be used against the people whenever the moment seems appropriate.

That moment will arrive in our time. The build-up has been long and protracted, as elsewhere, but the denouement will not be any different than it has been elsewhere. Our century has the unhappy distinction of reintroducing governmental torture, human slavery, genocide and fanatical Humanism. There is no difference between the revolution building here and elsewhere. {32}

The struggle to take control of the nation from inside Congress is no different than the methods applied successfully in France so long ago, in the Russian Duma so long ago, and in the German Reichstag so long ago. They seem foreign and different only to those who are unacquainted with revolution, and who harbor the quaint illusion that the United States is immune from the processes of unchecked revolution.

The crisis—the inevitable crisis—will arrive when the credit of our government at home and abroad is exhausted. The citizenry is nearing the end of its credit capacity—and so is the government.

On the surface, we appear to have inexhaustible wealth. We have mansions and luxury hotels, clouds of airplanes and tens of millions of cars, television and radio sets, mountains of clothes and food. The statisticians tell us that we have reduced legal poverty to 15 percent of the population.

But the deeper reality is that this is an unhappy country with a pro-Soviet media. We have undertakers of our values digging diligently away on every side. We have pornographers in educational administration and trimmers rising in politics.

These facts, however, appeared much the same last year, just as the population is much the same. To many, the situation does not appear greatly changed. The media says the presidency is wounded. Not that the country is wounded, but that the presidency is wounded. This is to regard our political system as just another game, in which the gains and losses are of only personal interest. Nothing means much to those who hold that view—unless the loss is their own and immediate.

Three centuries ago, John Locke said,

A company of Chessmen, standing on the same squares where we left them, we say, are all in the same place or unmoved; though perhaps the chessboard has been in the meantime carried out of one room into another...or perhaps the ship it is in sails all the while....

I submit that the ship we are all in has sailed far in the last years, and carried us all into deeper and darker waters, while we have remained—like the chessmen—on the same squares.

In reality, however, our Ship of State is moving toward a denouement. And in that event, *it* would be well to bear in mind the words of James Anthony Froude, the famous English historian, who said,

Government by suffrage is possible only in periods when the convictions of men have ceased to be vital to them. As long as there is a minority that would rather die than continue in a lie, there is a further court of appeal from which there is no reference. When ten men are {33} so earnest on one side that they will sooner be killed than give way, and twenty men are earnest enough on the other side to cast their votes for it, but will not risk their skins, the ten will give the law to the twenty.

It should be clear from these observations that the present generation holds the future of the United States in its hands. What we do today determines tomorrow—if God wills.

Tolstoi, in his *War and Peace*, described how the battle of Borodino, which determined Napoleon's defeat in Russia, was decided by the fact that one battery, unaware of the Russian order to retreat, kept firing. The French, in the confusion, mistook that unceasing cannonade as a sign their offensive had failed, and themselves retreated. But the battery never knew what it had done, nor did any other branch of the Russian army. Resistance to revolution, in the same sense, cannot be predicated upon public recognition: it must simply be implacable.

There have been, however, revolutions halted by individual action that we can cite. For the revolutionaries, despite their boasts, do not always win. The revolutionary tide is not "inevitable."

In World War I, the German General Staff set up several efforts to win the war by subverting the governments of Russia, France and Britain. We know that their support of Lenin proved successful—and we know the price that Germany later paid to the Frankenstein it helped into life. But the German General Staff also funded revolution in Ireland in 1916 (revolutions do cost money), and gave money to Sir Roger Casement and other Irish rebels. The Easter Rebellion, as it was called, failed—but not without loss of life and an exacerbation of ill-will between England and Ireland.

The most ambitious effort at subversion was made by Germany against France. There, German money and propaganda not only created mutinous cadres inside the French Army, but planted traitors inside the French Chamber of Deputies. These posed as ardent lovers of peace, and sought to weaken the French military effort and fighting spirit in every way. They were assisted by pro-German newspapers that promoted defeatism and surrender, and a gaggle of intellectuals of varying degrees of sincerity. General Petain quelled the Army mutiny by stern and secret measures, and Clemenceau, then in his 70s, rose inside the Chamber of Deputies to hurl the charge of treason—and made it stick. These two elderly men, one considered mediocre and the other at the end of his career, saved France from revolution at a moment of deep and terrible crisis.

Other occasions come to mind. In Spain, the revolution

forced the {34} abdication of the King in 1931. A republic was declared, and several elections were won by the Left. Finally the Left gained control of the Spanish Cates, and the government. It then consolidated its revolution by ordering all large family-owned estates broken up. Then, because the revolution was against religion and against freedom of thought or faith, it ordered all religious orders dissolved. But the revolution does not rely only upon decrees; it uses Terror. The Spanish government, under the control of revolutionaries, launched a wave of murders of priests and nuns, and the physical destruction of churches, convents and monasteries. At that, the Spaniards rose in rebellion, defeated the Communists and set off a wave of Leftist denunciations that endures to this day. But the revolution in Spain was rolled back.

The revolution in recent times mourned over Chile, moved by Allende into the Communist camp, but recovered for a time by Chileans too well aware of the Gulag maintained by revolutionary “idealists” (who have again gained strength in that country).

The worldwide revolutionary tide continues to flow. It does more than lap at our shores: it has seeped into our Congress, as it long ago entered our media, our universities and even our mainline churches.

It cannot be stanchd or deflected by pretending that it does not exist. An unrecognized revolution can, as in France, Russia, Germany and elsewhere, carry us all beyond the point of peaceful return if we remain uncomprehending and passive. We need the moral courage and insight of Clemenceau; the physical spirit of the Spaniards in the Thirties.

Revolutions cannot be halted by incomprehension. But to know the plans of the enemy is to have a great advantage. To arouse the nation to those plans is not impossible; all America is uneasily aware that something is wrong. What is needed are voices to rally counter-revolutionary resistance. The defense of our tripartite government from congressional efforts to reduce the president to the status of a civil servant (answerable to congressional inquiries that usurp the proper functions of the courts) is a defense against the final stage of revolution.

For make no mistake about it: the process underway in Congress is revolutionary in nature. We have men in America as hungry for supreme power, as ruthless and determined, as any in the world.

But we also have the largest number of educated, skilled citizens of any nation in all history. Once aware of the danger, we Americans can end what the revolutionaries among us are already calling Our Revolution. {35}

2. CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER

THE CRISES IN CIVILIZATION

Otto Scott

The following was adapted from three addresses given during the First International Conference on Christian Reconstruction, London, Oct. 28, 1989.

We are in our day confronted with the greatest of issues at a critical period, but the situation we face is not new. Our civilization is in crisis, and has been in decline for several generations. But other civilizations have undergone similar declines culminating in suicide. The Christian civilization is unique because it has already gone to the brink at least twice and recovered. That is unprecedented. We can, I believe, take this as proof of our special destiny under Almighty God, whom we serve.

The first pre-Christian civilization of which we have a fairly complete record is that of the Greeks. They believed in the cyclical theory of history, in which everything would recur: the seasons, the positions of the stars, the lives of people. Everything would go around and come around, forever and ever. In that closed circle, which anticipated Sartre by thousands of years, and from which there was no exit, lay the seeds of Grecian despair.

We see it as early as in *The Odyssey*, when Odysseus refused to stay with the goddess Kalypso, even when she offered him {38} immortality. What good is immortality, one can hear him saying, in a world condemned to repetition? What good is anything, in such a world?

One historian, analyzing the reasons for the suicide of the Greek civilization, said it was “a failure of nerve.” But it was more than that. It was despair. Despair of the ultimate justice of God.

A similar despair overtook the Romans, once they had achieved

worldly success. Success is a great spiritual challenge. it contains all the lures of power. unlimited vice, unlimited injustice, unlimited crime, unlimited comfort, unlimited hypocrisy reflected in the admiration of the world.

The Romans, like the Greeks, became suicidal. They were heading toward extinction when Our Lord appeared. And His Words pulled those who listened back from the brink.

That was the first and greatest Reconstruction. For the first time, an entire civilization mired in decay was lifted and transformed into an entirely new condition, against the will of its government and many of its leaders. Christians did this despite persecution, torture and humiliations for nine generations. Then, after Constantine, Christians converted a savage Europe from human sacrifice to the faith, and created the richest, most diverse, most successful civilization the world had ever known.

As always, that success became a great challenge. As the Renaissance expanded, Christianity became the first religion in all history to achieve global status. It spread to Asia and to the Yucatan and to the edges of Africa. But as it spread abroad, it decayed at home. Decayed amid riches, like Greece; like Rome.

We remember Luther's disgust, when he said there was everything in Rome except an honest man. Every vice reappeared. pornography, pseudo-science, incest and other perversions, magic and envy, crime and tyranny.

The Renaissance lasted for over three centuries. Its pattern corrupted Christianity's European hope, while its explorers, priests and merchants spread the Christian message to the world.

Precedents For Christian Reconstruction In Seventeenth Century England

This may sound a long way from seventeenth century England, but it is not. England, a small outpost of Europe, occasional enemy of France but essentially a minor power, joined the Renaissance late, in the time of Henry VIII. {39}

He was a perfect Renaissance Prince: learned and ruthless, popular and despotic. He forced the English to abandon their traditional faith and accept whatever he decided they had to obey.

He did this at a time when Luther shook all Europe, and shortly

before Calvin laid the foundations for religious liberty in Geneva.

After Henry, and after his young son Edward VI, England had Bloody Mary and the sacrifices of hundreds of Calvinists and other Reformers. Then Elizabeth, and her famous compromise. Calvinism decorated with Catholic trimmings, under the iron hand of the State.

These are well-known facts, not new, but worth recalling for the light they throw on England as a civilization. From being told not to be Catholic, and also not to dissent from Henry's brand of national church, to being told to be Catholic again or be burned alive, to accepting Elizabeth's ideas of a properly mixed church—the English never once rebelled.

That is not to say that all obeyed. They certainly had martyrs. men and women who refused to say they believed what they did not believe. Who openly defied the authorities of the government, and went to their deaths without weakening. And there were those who weakened, for whom we must have sympathy, for saints are rare, just as genius is rare. And we must assume that the martyrs were superior, because God exacts the most from the best.

But in general the English under Henry and Edward and Mary and Elizabeth did not exhibit the religious fervor of the Dutch, or the Germans, or—for that matter—the Spaniards. And that brings to mind certain thoughts about the English of that time.

Their situation was, of course, unique. they were protected from all their enemies except the Scots by the Channel; they had not endured the incessant invasions of Europe. They were, in a comparative sense, rich. And they retained more of their liberties from the Ages of Faith longer than did the peoples of Europe in the Renaissance.

Their Renaissance began with Henry, and lasted through Elizabeth. Their Reformation also started with Henry, and lasted after Elizabeth. So they lived in a mixed period, and their theology was mixed.

They had, however, Celts in the North of an entirely different disposition. The Scots, once they began to experience the Renaissance on a small scale under Mary Stuart, didn't like it. They turned toward Calvin and Knox, and Presbyterianism. That was a revolution, and a very important one.

It marked the only truly Calvinist victory of the period, and it

{40} marked the first time ever in Christianity where the church became not only equal, but independent from the state.

To Elizabeth and the English, however, the Knoxian Revolution in Scotland was too passionate. Too stern and austere, too firm and distinct.

That was not the English way, for the English are a blended people. They will fight, but they will also compromise. They are practical in the sense that they leave room for differences within their social order; they admire but do not worship their leaders. they indulge in self-criticism. Sometimes their complexity is mirrored in individuals.

Elizabeth's closest advisor, Cecil, was such a person. He obeyed Henry VIII in religious as well as political matters; he obeyed the two different Protectors who appeared in the reign of Edward VI. He went along with the effort to make Lady Jane Grey a queen, then he obeyed Bloody Mary in all details—and finally wound up at the right hand of Elizabeth. Many consider him a man with no principles at all, but under Elizabeth he steered the state toward reform, inch by inch and step by step.

Cecil was appalled when Elizabeth created the High Commission to enforce religious conformity to whatever she decided. He called it an Inquisition—which it was.

Later, when James VI of Scotland and I of England succeeded Elizabeth, Cecil's son, the leading advisor of the new king, tried to tell him that the High Commission had grown onerous. England, by the seventeenth century, had grown tired of enameled tyranny, tired of Renaissance rulers who used learning and patronage of the arts as a gloss for despotism.

Their dissatisfaction was deepened by the fact that James I was impossible to respect His flagrant homosexuality led him to elevate contemptible men for unspeakable reasons. One of these, the Earl of Somerset, became involved in a murder. His trial was sensational; reading it reminds one of Florence at its worst. All sorts of underworld elements were exposed: astrologers and poisoners, magicians and madams, intrigues stretching from the sewer to Whitehall.

Atop this dung heap sat a monarch who made absurd claims to divine omnipotence. James argued that God favored hereditary monarchy, and that kings, being divinely chosen, had divine rights

on earth and therefore their authority could not be challenged.

This directly contradicted God, who told the Israelites how a mortal ruler would tyrannize them; it contradicted the fact that Isaac was not the eldest son of Jacob nor David of Jesse nor Solomon of {41} David.

It also contradicted the political history and tradition of England where Henry I, Henry IV, Henry V and Henry VI, Richard III and Henry VII had all ruled in defiance of descent. Even Elizabeth's legitimacy was questionable.

Consequently James exacerbated religious and political dispute from the moment he occupied the throne. His arguments ran against both tides, for to place birth above merit, as he did, was to chill the rise of new men—a phenomenon for which the English were becoming conspicuous. And to assume that a sinner—a category he most conspicuously fit—was divine, and authorized to use divine power, was to blaspheme the faith from the highest podium in the realm.

Although James' claims were outrageous, he seems to have judged London fairly shrewdly. The majority of men and women—then and now—want mainly to pursue their own lives and to let others run the world and the church.

A minority, however, felt differently. That minority accepted the idea that we are all in part responsible for the condition of the world. They accepted the burdens as well as the consolations of the faith. They could not accept the dangerous claims of King James that he could overrule the rights of Parliament and the law, the rights of the church and the people.

Therefore a series of confrontations occurred between the Crown and Parliament, between the king and courts of law—and between the High Commission and the people. I say the people instead of the minority of the Calvinists or the Puritans, because the High Commission was authorized to censure writers and printers, and sermons and private letters and conversations and behavior as well as theological dissent.

In political terms England had, paralleling the High Commission, a Star Chamber which applied torture in cases of treason. At a time when a comment or a letter could be considered treason, the English found both their political and their religious liberties not only threatened, but denied.

England under James was a time of spiritual decay. Fashionable persons regarded sincere Christians with contempt. Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones produced Masques for the court, at which the queen and her ladies-in-waiting appeared in costumes once restricted to courtesans. Masks became essential for ladies in public, even for hunting; to appear without one was to be bare-faced and immodest. The nobility and the wealthy wore jewels on their clothing. {42} Buckingham, the last of James' ambiguous favorites, trimmed his coat with diamond buttons, wore diamond hat bands and earrings, had diamonds speckled on his cloak and sword and even on the feather in his hat.

Meanwhile, the theater indulged itself at Puritan expense. Satires abounded; Puritans were treated as grotesques. As the years passed and such plays increased, Puritans came to detest the theater and everyone connected with it. the dramatists and the actors and especially, when they appeared, the actresses.

This may not sound serious, but it is the essence of social life. To treat some members of society as less than all others, to hold the views of a substantial number of people up to public ridicule while forbidding them to defend themselves under the threat of legal and social penalties is to create rage and hatred.

This situation festered all through James' reign. By the time he died in 1624 he had destroyed the Presbyterian system in Scotland and the freedom of the Kirk in that land. He had used his power to launch the elimination of Calvinism and the introduction of Arminianism into the Church of England.

During that process the Puritans and the Independents, the Separatists and other Calvinists found themselves pressed by Arminians on all levels: in the universities and at court, in art, literature and theater, in law and in life.

One historian observed that "... Puritans, against whom every drunkard belched forth profane scoffs, as finding it the most gameful way of fooling, could no longer find vent for their feelings in speech or writing. They took refuge in sullen silence, and in this silence lay the portent ominous of the approach of civil war."¹

Charles I reaped the whirlwind. He was foolish enough to continue the despotism of his father, to sponsor Arminianism

1. Bateson, *Social England*, Vol. IV, London: C.P. Putnam's, 1895, 172.

in the English Church, which became as a result steadily more Catholic, at a time when the majority regarded the Vatican as Satan's residence. Charles ruled without Parliament for years. His Archbishop of Canterbury was an ecclesiastical tyrant who humiliated Scots Presbyterians and English Calvinists alike.

All this made war inevitable. A real civil war, which—despite Marxist historians—was not a class struggle, because all the classes were divided over political and religious issues. Its beginning was launched by the Scots, who wanted their Presbyterianism back; it developed to the point where Charles agreed to govern within limits. But because he couldn't keep his word, Calvinists, Puritans, Presbyterians, Independents, Levellers and others finally put him on {43} trial and executed him as an enemy of the people.

That was, in hindsight, a serious mistake. The monarchy then enjoyed a mystique so sweeping, so accepted, so deep, that men fainted when they heard that a legitimate king had been decapitated by his own subjects. It would be as though rebels in modern America burned the Constitution on television because this document had accumulated so many baroque additions, so many elaborate judicial interpretations, that its original outlines no longer exist and there was no really practical way to restore it.

The logic of such an act might be visible, but its effect would be ruinous upon any party and any cause that undertook it. That was what happened to Cromwell and his Independents. They lost, overnight, sympathy and support. Men who shared their resentment of the mistreatment of Parliament and the rights of the people in both religious and political areas (and of course, the two cannot ever, then or now or ever, be separated), fled from the Parliament that killed the king.

It must be recalled that at that time, alienating a man was a multiple action, for men took their family associations seriously. Families moved as such.

With a diminished and unrepresentative Parliament, Cromwell was forced, step by step, to rule by military force. It was, however, a military force that not only restored Britain, but improved it as a nation in a new sense; in terms beyond Elizabeth at her greatest.

Under Cromwell the New Order Army of believers was unlike any ever assembled since Old Testament days. The soldiers elected their officers by majority vote, discussed the Bible and theology

over camp fires, neither pillaged nor raped, and were nearly irresistible in battle.

Internationally, Cromwell protected Protestant interests, fought successful wars with Holland and Portugal, outfought Spain in the Caribbean and humbled the pirates of Tripoli.

At home Cromwell's Protectorate preserved the Common Law, abolished the remnants of feudalism, destroyed what chance there had been of religious uniformity, proved that England was now strong enough to control Ireland and, more difficult job, Scotland by arms if need be, preserved the supremacy of the Common Law, established the supremacy of the Royal Navy, permitted the return of the Jews (and the construction of the first synagogue in London), established the new East India Company, the National Debt, the alliance of the richest part of the landed aristocracy with the great mercantile interest. These made possible the British Empire of the {44} eighteenth century.²

Protestants everywhere were protected while Cromwell lived. When he died "he was laid among the ancient sovereigns of England with funeral pomp such as London had never before seen. Yet the royalists, when they returned, said Macaulay, had the "miserable satisfaction of digging up, hanging, quartering and burning the remains of the greatest prince that has ever ruled England."³

The greatest prince, and leader of the greatest, though shortest-lived, revolution in the West. After his death, Calvinist rule collapsed. The 50,000-man army was disbanded. For possibly the first time ever, its veterans peacefully vanished into the people. And another contemptible Stuart—Charles II—was handed the throne.

All this has been often described. What is equally often described but hardly ever analyzed is why Calvinists, who pulled England from the depths to the heights, left such a legacy of hatred.

Macaulay, a master of elegant invective, has left a memorable portrait of the Calvinist fringe known as the Puritans. It is in his highly colored style, but it seems fairly close to the bone.

2. D.W. Brogan, *The Price of Revolution* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951), 23.

3. Thomas Macaulay, *The History of England*, 179.

“The dress,” he said, “the deportment, the language, the studies, the amusements of the rigid sect were regulated on principles not unlike those of the Pharisees, who, proud of their washed hands and broad phylacteries, taunted the Redeemer as a Sabbath-breaker and a wine-bibber. It was a Sin to hang garlands on a May-pole, to drink a friend’s health, to fly a hawk, to play at chess, to wear love-locks, to put starch in a ruff, to touch the virginals, to read the Fairy Queen.”

“Rules such as these,” he said, “would have appeared insupportable to the free and joyous spirit of Luther, and contemptible to the serene and philosophic intellect of Zwingli, and threw over all life a monastic gloom.”

Then he made a comment that throws a great light on the supporters of the Protectorate.

The learning and eloquence by which the Great Reformers had been so eminently distinguished, and to which they had been, in no small measure, indebted for their success, were regarded by the new school of Protestants with suspicion, if not with aversion. Some... had scruples about teaching Latin grammar because the names of Mars, Bacchus and Apollo occurred in it. The fine arts were all but proscribed. The solemn peal of the organ was superstitious...half the fine paintings in England were idolatrous, and the other half indecent....

Nor was that all. Laws were enacted against a flock of public amusements. Theaters were closed and dismantled. Puppet shows were banned. Sporting events were outlawed. Christmas, said the {45} Long Parliament, was to be marked by fasting instead of feasting. That led to riots, defiance and immeasurable ill-will.

Cromwell’s soldiers were remarkable in not looting or plundering the people—as did the Cavaliers and their mercenaries. But some of Cromwell’s soldiers halted dancing, bell ringing and hockey games. Others broke stained-glass windows, and had to be restrained from dragging ministers out of their pulpits if they disagreed with the sermon.

Cromwell did not favor such extremes. He reopened the theaters. He refused to purge his army of Anabaptists and other sectarians. But the commander-in-chief could hardly stop the bad treatment of such men in the ranks. The Quakers, for instance, created all sorts of problems. One of their habits was to strip naked

and to invade church services. They painted their faces black and appeared in sheets to denounce sin and sinners, claiming a superiority because of their Inner Light. They were not the genteel citizens we know today.

To the general public the difference between the Quakers and Ranters and Levellers and Puritans and Scots Presbyterians and orthodox Calvinists was indistinguishable. Like the old American joke about the policeman arresting a demonstrator who protested that he was an anti-Communist. The policeman said, "I don't care what kind of Communist you are."

But these are old, well-known observations. To discover why the Puritans of England left hatreds that were not known in Geneva, or in Edinburgh, or in Holland or in Scandinavia, we must look deeper. Our purpose is to confront the errors as well as the triumphs of that period, because we would like to repeat its triumphs and avoid its errors.

The greatest insight of the Puritans was to acknowledge that religion cannot be confined inside the church. That Christianity is not simply concerned with the ecclesiastical, but with all of life.

We know that no society has ever appeared without a faith, and that no society has ever outlasted its loss of faith. That was the downfall of the Greeks and the Romans; that is the great lesson of history.

What was the great Puritan error? Many later argued that it was intolerance, and they cite prohibitions against relatively minor amusements and celebrations as proof. But in large matters Calvinists, of whom Cromwell was a fitting representative, were not fanatics. Cromwell reopened the theaters, and refused to cashier an Anabaptist officer for his beliefs, on the grounds that a man who was {46} willing to give his life for the Protectorate did not deserve bad treatment. As time passed Cromwell grew increasingly respectful of public ritual, of pomp, and of the need to persuade people into patterns that cannot be forced.

I do not believe that the Calvinist revolution set impossible goals, and I admire the fact that it brought so superb a leader to the top.

But Cromwell was not the only man in that Revolution. it included extremists who forced extreme measures. One such measure was the execution of the king. Never mind that Charles

was contemptible; never mind that he could not tell the truth or keep his word; that he believed a king was above such necessities. His execution provided a pattern later imitated by French and Russian revolutionaries.

To execute the king instead of exiling him, was to insult the people and the nation that had supported Charles for so long. If the king had died in battle he would have been considered heroic; his memory could have been honored in common. If he had been supplanted by a different, better king, that had been accepted before. But to use cold logic in an emotional situation was a great error. That Charles I was a public enemy was true, but that does not lessen the shock to the culture, which needed to be healed, not outraged.

The other great error was to allow Calvinist zealots to attack the arts and the artists. There were reasons, of course. The theater had persistently mocked Puritanism, had satirized the most religious people in the nation, had introduced all sorts of corruptions—but not all corruption. Many Puritan clergymen did not seem to appreciate the theatricality of the pulpit, or realize that sermons are an art form.

The entire Reformation, from Luther to Calvin to Knox, including all the varieties of Calvinism including Puritanism (they were not synonymous), had been built upon print. The English Puritans seemed to overlook literature as a branch of the arts. They respected books while denying their imagery, the music of language and its appeal to the senses as well as the intellect.

They overlooked the lessons inherent in Shakespeare, who illustrated the virtues as well as the vices of humanity. When the Protectorate was in power, and hypocrites joined its ranks, many Puritans proved unable to tell the difference between lip service and real service until it was too late.

Perhaps a better knowledge of the world would have been useful then. Some Puritans seem to have expected every man to be a clergyman, but every man is not called to that special vocation. God {47} has given men many vocations—and each is worthy of respect. Samson the mighty warrior and Job the owner of huge flocks of sheep were not prophets of Israel. Every man is not called to the same task in the same way at the same time. The goals of the faith are pursued within one's vocation and society is composed

of many vocations. God did not make individuals interchangeable and synonymous.

Intellectuals by whatever name are the rationalizers and explainers of a civilization. They include the masters of imagery and persuasion.

Painters and musicians, poets and singers, actors and playwrights, writers and orators bridge the gap between theologians and congregations, audiences and dramatists, scholars and people. It's obvious to us that every branch of art and learning can be misused; it was equally obvious in the time of Elizabeth, more so under James I, much more so under Charles I.

For the Puritans to throw the arts away was an act of amazing recklessness. To close the theaters was to outlaw a vehicle which, when launched under the Greeks, was so powerful that men fainted. That was to lump Shakespeare with the worst, and to forget that life itself is a drama and not a lecture.

By attempting to stop dancing the Puritans forgot that David danced before the Ark, and that Psalms were once lyrics to music. To stop sports was to interfere with the right of young men to compete in peace with one another, and the right of the people to lay aside their cares.

They forgot that authority is not intended to narrow but to enlarge opportunities. Their view of Almighty God was too narrow for an entire society to accept. They rejected more than they accepted—and were themselves rejected by more than would accept them, for in God's world, the punishment always fits the crime.

When we look at the Puritans over the space of 450 years, we are torn between admiration and pity. They achieved practical wonders in an amazingly brief period of time, and were paid in contempt and persecution for generations afterward.

The Restoration, which arrived with Charles II, showed what real religious persecution is like. The Anglican Church imprisoned and fined, mutilated and pursued and harried tens of thousands out of the realm.

Historians talk about a "Merry Monarch" who fastened tyrannical patterns on the American colonies, who was on the payroll of Louis XIV and whose court was a sewer.

But that's another story. What we can say today, with all the past

revolutionary experiments unrolled for our examination, is that the Calvinist Revolution of the seventeenth century proved that a determined minority armed with a fixed, coherent worldview, could enlist an unfocused but discontented majority to assume supreme control.

The Calvinists also proved that a disciplined military force can maintain power against the will of a majority as long as a supreme leader holds control. Some of the other lessons the Calvinists left for the future to analyze, was that a carpet of persuasive literature has to precede action—for the word always goes before the deed.

It was over a century before the French applied some of these lessons in their atheist Revolution—the first in the history of Christendom and perhaps in the world—and another century before the Russians and their imitators introduced the revolutions of our time.

This entire sequence carries us, despite our wishes, back to the Greeks. Their fratricidal wars, especially the Peloponnesian War, are held to be the snapped spring that led to their decline. But long before that war, the entire Grecian civilization was in deep spiritual trouble.

The Calvinists struggled against spiritual decay, and managed, for all-too-brief a period, to first win, and then lose. Their loss need not have been permanent, but it was apparently so devastating to them that they never truly recovered. They retreated to their churches. They turned toward commerce and science. They applied their faith in these areas so well that they created the Industrial Revolution, which lifted the standards of all the world to unprecedented heights of luxury and efficiency.

But in the process they forgot that they had once held aloft a dream of spiritual power for all the world. Their great vision receded. Their descendants became increasingly practical. But despite all material and passing impressions, this is not an entirely practical world. It is a world where imaginations and emotions, conscience and aspirations jostle against abilities and temptations, vices and illusions. For all Christians, this is a world suffused with the Presence of God.

The great power of Christianity in its formative centuries was that it enraptured imaginations and turned the minds of pagans toward eternity. Christianity spread by attracting every talent. the

illustrator in the monastery, the painter, the musician, the sculptor, the poet, the dreamer and the man of practical projects, the old and the young; servants and masters alike.

The Christian worldview, unlike the Greek or the Roman, opened a {49} limitless vista. Life was unique, was unrepeatable, was the time of trial that leads to God. That worldview carried our civilization everywhere, and continues to sustain all the billions of people on earth.

When that worldview flags, the entire world sinks downward. Like Greeks, we are confronted with the splinters of our faith. But unlike the Greeks and the Romans, our faith is renewable; does not lead to a dead end, but to eternal life.

Individual Christians cannot survive the loss of their faith. But individual Christians who discover their faith, or hold fast to their faith, are capable—with the help of God—of extraordinary achievements. The Calvinists who surged through England proved the strength of their faith by transforming that land so thoroughly that it became great as a result of their impetus.

We can only speculate on whether the Calvinists would have ruled longer had Puritan zealots (among others) not alienated the arts. we can only compare the political longevity of the Counter-Revolution, which advanced neither science nor industry, but which assiduously used the arts, with the remarkably short life of Calvinist dominance.

Finally, we today confront many of the problems the Calvinists faced. Christianity is in splinters in many parts of the world; its institutions and leaders are weak. Our civilization, like that of the Greeks and the Romans, is in retreat. But we have what they lacked. a faith in a limitless future under an omnipotent God. Our faith, unlike theirs, is renewable.

We can analyze, praise and deplore the past; we can point to errors and triumphs of great men and women, but only if we use our powers of analysis to do our part today. We can hope to avoid the Puritan error of making our appeal too narrow. We can instead radiate the entire, soaring vision of our faith, which changed the direction of an earlier paganism by restoring a sense of the sacred, a feeling of joy and an appreciation of beauty to the world.

The World Scene and Current Issues: The Right Approach

Before we deal with as large a subject as the world scene, let's look at the world in contemporary terms when my grandfathers were men in their thirties, in the 1890s. The world was then dominated—at least on the surface—by the Christian civilization. Christian ministers and priests, nuns and sisters, churches and schools, spread across the globe. Christian physicians and nurses, schoolteachers and engineers, agricultural experts and other {50} professionals, taught every race, every other civilization, the fruits of Christian effort.

No other civilization had ever before done that, including the Roman. The West, which includes the United States, held nothing back for its own exclusive use, like the Chinese did. Far from enslaving, it freed millions from slavery. Far from taking what poorer civilizations possessed, like the Mongols and the modern Russians, it built roads and bridges, homes and factories for others to use.

The spread of Christianity meant the spread of ideas of individual freedom, rights of self-expression, longer spans of life, better treatment of others. It meant the end of the endless wars inside the Indian subcontinent; the eternal wars of black African tribes with one another, the end of human sacrifice in Asia and Africa, the beginning of the first worldwide civilization in all history.

In the period from 1789 to 1889, however, these triumphs of Christianity were shadowed by a dark undercurrent that first emerged during the atheist revolution in France, and that shadowed every Christian endeavor.

That undercurrent, sometimes limited to the periphery and sometimes implied in press coverage, in novels, in monographs and lectures, gradually spread the Humanist denigration of Christian thought. It spoke of equality without responsibility, it spoke of poverty as the result of riches, it spoke of terror as a means of achieving brotherhood and it spoke of Christianity as the enemy.

It spoke very cunningly. One is reminded of the false gospels that Satan inspired in the early years of the faith. It skillfully used

the weapons of religion in the service of anti-religion. Compassion for the poor, the austerity of a new leadership, the inevitability of socialist victory.

Our grandfathers saw the beginning of all this, and our fathers saw it emerge in Russia in 1917, armed with the shock of novelty and the support—tacit at first and increasingly vocal through the years—of the *literati* and the *cognoscenti*. Since World War II we have seen it spread across the globe, in multiple forms and disguises, but always discernible by its anti-Christianity.

That has been the pattern until very recently. And until very recently, as Christianity retreated and lost one stronghold after another, one nation after another, one government, in various degrees, after another, it has not really been possible to say that tomorrow things will be better.

All during this period we have been subjected to the greatest barrage of anti-Christian propaganda the world has ever seen, by {51} more instruments of communication than ever before existed. The press, the radio, TV, magazines, journals, books, lectures, films, tapes, speeches.

This has penetrated the mind of the world to an unprecedented extent. Unlike our forebears, we find no places of privacy, no possible retreats. The world has crawled into our heads and keeps chattering at us, using instruments controlled by our enemies.

In this unceasing cacophony it is difficult for even stable persons to retain their balance. It is no wonder the young are confused and—in increasing numbers—suicidal, for the purpose of anti-Christianism is to persuade us to die, to end the Christian civilization as have other civilizations—by suicide. “He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul; all they that hate me love death.”

This purpose has been difficult for many to perceive, for they have been inundated, so to speak, by the torrents of propaganda that have washed through their lives.

This is understandable, because the press reports the world much as scattered observers might report thousands of chess games being simultaneously played throughout the world. a *move at a time*.

News of the world, therefore, amounts to a stream of details without a pattern. The chancelleries and intelligence services pore

over this mass, and try to fit some of these details together, to see whether they disclose a significant change or development in what used to be called The Great Game of Power Politics.

Such expectations are, for the most part, disappointed. The news of the world is so packed with rumor and speculation, with gossip and insult, with crime and sports and weather and commercial movements and inventions that it amounts to a jumble.

Yet beneath the trash we can discern significance—if we have a standard by which to separate trash from truth.

Some years ago, I recall, there was considerable excitement in archaeological circles by the discovery of a Jewish site in Rome, of a community that was once active and prosperous during the second century AD. I'm not sure what the scholars expected to find. But I recall the general surprise when they found ancient horoscopes and spells, amulets, charms, gambling devices and a vast accumulation of trivia.

That should not have been a surprise. Christians know that Roman culture was in decline at that time; that there was widespread skepticism and a concomitant rise in superstition. No Roman neighborhood was free from the influence of what Hegel called The Spirit of the Age. The proof that Roman Jews were as influenced as {52} their neighbors by the times was simply evidence that the role of Jews was then, as it is now, a part of a larger society.

We can look at the information provided by the world much as an archaeologist searches a dig, for evidence of realities not seen, but nevertheless discernible.

In that sense, the world scene today contains much to encourage the cause of Christian Reconstruction. I say that not because the international Christian community has resolved its internal difficulties or come together in a coherent fashion against its many powerful enemies, but because these enemies are now running into sand.

The greatest atheistic power the world has ever seen, the Soviet Union, and its huge Asiatic shadow, Red China, are both in serious trouble because their system of command and control has destroyed their ability to feed and clothe their people. The crimes of the Chinese government against Tibet, and against the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples are now rising to irrepressible levels.

The problems of the Kremlin are well-known and highly

publicized, after seventy years of pro-Soviet propaganda by the western press. That propaganda is, of course, still at work. It serves to gloss over the presence of Soviet troops in Ethiopia, Syria, Libya, Cuba, parts of Middle Europe, Namibia and Angola and other parts of the world.

But the appearance of resentment verging on rebellion on the part of some of the subject peoples held in captivity by the Soviets. the Georgians and Armenians and Turks, Baltic citizens, are having a deep effect upon the areas where the Soviets are trying to expand their empire.

All that is well-known, but, as in the case of the archaeological dig in Rome, adds up to more than details.

We are today weary of certain arguments. Tired to the bone of hearing about the planned economy and its proponents, exhausted by analyses of “class struggle” and all the rest of the Marxist claptrap. We forget that it burst upon the world with the sound of bugles.

Because the sequence of how all this declined into the travesty of today is so familiar to us, we tend—I think—to overlook the deep historical importance of this particular period.

We recall how the Soviets—a word that means committee—thought they would uproot and destroy all religions and especially Christianity. They closed or razed the churches, murdered priests and nuns and set up atheist museums, ended seminaries and stopped religious ceremonies. Even prayer became a crime; the possession of the Bible meant Siberia.

Goté, whose diary of the early revolutionary period has only {53} recently been published,⁴ tells us that the study of law was abolished at the University of Moscow in September 1918 as “irrelevant to the new socialist polity,” and that the studies of history and philosophy were abandoned in favor of a new school of social sciences the following spring.

Therefore the World War I generation—my father’s generation—saw the start of the great world campaign to bring anti-Christianism down from speculative monographs and sideline jeering into the policies of government.

4. *Time of Troubles. The Diary of Irulii Vladimirovich Goté*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1988.

The operational stage of this effort was launched by the Commissar of Enlightenment—Anatoly Lunacharsky—to create a new, Communist religion, with Lenin as God.⁵

It started with propaganda: with biographies that described Lenin's life in terms of miracles and prophecies, with iconographic posters, and assertions that he lived and died for the freedom of the oppressed. His body was embalmed and the Soviet press extolled it as another marvel of modern science. Some observers now believe it is simply wax. Rumors of Lenin's resurrection were floated, Premier Kalinin in a speech said that Lenin left his mausoleum and entered the Kremlin. He asked two janitors what the Commissars were saying. "They said that Lenin died but now we have twice as many Communists as before," he was told. So he returned to rest. Then he went to a factory, and was told the icons were gone and the workers were all Communists. Finally, he went to a peasant's hut, and was astonished to find Red Posters everywhere. "Are you not Christians?" he asked, and they said, "Yes, but this is a reading room and here is the Lenin Corner."⁶

Meanwhile "poems, portraits, busts, monuments (appeared); Lenin's face was fired onto porcelain pitchers, teacups and plates; appeared on jewelry, on candy wrappers, on cigarette boxes." Institutions took his name, people named their children after him. In 1924, more than 17 million copies of books by and about Lenin were printed. The next year the figure was even higher.

The commissars pored over the history of Christianity for examples, and created a set of symbols that resembled a religion. They insisted that people read Lenin's works, think about him, visit the places where he had lived, make pilgrimages to his grave in search of solace.

All this was accompanied by anti-Christian propaganda through lectures and discussions, books and newspapers, plays and exhibits. New revolutionary holidays were created. People knew that they had no choice but to pay lip service to the cult if they expected to live— {54} let alone prosper.

On May Day, entire factories and neighborhoods were

5. Nina Tumarkin, *Lenin Lives* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).

6. *Ibid.*, 197.

mobilized together with the armed services and the bureaucracy to march past Lenin's Tomb, to salute as they passed the figures of the Kremlin leaders and to carry huge images of Lenin, Stalin and other gods of the Revolution.

It is interesting that these parades have never been completely described to the American people. The only time I saw an adequate presentation was in a Swiss hotel some twenty years ago, when the TV camera was fixed on the parade for about two hours.

It is interesting that neither the press nor the scholars of the West saw anything ridiculous in these grotesque exhibitions, these heavy-handed and low-level imitations of Christianity. In fact, just the opposite took place.

The Humanist imitation was—and is still—treated with the greatest respect. The arguments it stole from Christianity: compassion for the poor, the austerity of the best part of the clergy, the ingatherings of the faithful, the confessional, the inevitability of God's Will and the omnipotence of God's Grace, were twisted into arguments that the poor could be helped by destroying the rich, that the leaders of the Revolution were selfless, that only Party members were fit to lead and instruct, that there was an "inevitable triumph of Socialism."

The resemblances between the Humanist arguments and Covenant Man were not accidental. Satan himself can be credited with such a cunningly devised, basically evil twisting of the Word of God.

It was no wonder the Nazis used the same trappings. the same parades, the same massing of crowds, the lights, the music, false literature, the symbols of a new age. All the imitators did the same. the dictators of tiny African nations, the ridiculous Castro, Mao Tse Tung, Mengistu and others.

All in vain. The entire edifice, constructed brick by brick by a long row of writers and artists, ranging from Rousseau and David to Shaw and Picasso, is now falling to earth before our eyes.

That is the great meaning of the World Scene today. All sorts of frantic efforts are under way to shore up the crumbling structure of anti-Christian Socialism in all its reaches—and all in vain.

This is not an event that affects the Russians and Middle Europe alone; it is not confined to China and Vietnam, or to the Yucatan or South America or to Africa.

We should not overlook the extent to which our fathers' world was {55} engulfed by the pernicious theories of those who hate Christianity and sought to replace it by Humanism and its offshoots. In the United States the term Socialist early acquired odium, and very few serious adults were willing to identify themselves as such. Instead, Americans Socialists call themselves "liberals," an old and once-honorable term, and in that guise have promoted every tenet of anti-Christianity.

These have ranged from the arguments of the old Levellers, to the effect that nobody is better than anyone else, to the theft instead of the confiscation of property first by onerous taxation and then by debasing the currency.

In World War II the American position was that western Europe should abandon its colonies in the name of Wilsonian self-determination and Rooseveltian anti-colonialism. This argument fit precisely in the plans of the USSR, our wartime ally. We all know the results.

After abandoning its colonies, western Europe shriveled to the status it occupied in the sixteenth century. a set of commercial Atlantic powers.

Washington said, "You no longer need great navies and armies and air forces. we will protect you from all perils." And step by step, Britain and France, Spain and Holland, Belgium and Portugal, left the world stage to become second-class regional powers. Members of NATO.

Meanwhile, the USSR expanded everywhere, with Washington pretending not to notice. Its navy outstripped all others combined. Its merchant fleet is now 7,000 vessels to the American 350. Its weapons dwarf all other armies; its planes and tanks outnumber all others.

And while this has been under way, Washington, London, Paris, Bonn, Madrid, Rome and every other government accepted the Soviet method of printing pieces of paper to replace money.

This was not accomplished in a day, but nevertheless, was accomplished fairly quickly. Today there is not a nation in the world whose government issues real money. We live amid societies funded by paper, accompanied by noise.

The standards of Christianity have no standing in the eyes of our governments.

Yet the currency situation is not our largest problem. The real problems of the world are not material, but conceptual. In arguing against the global presence of Western Europe, the United States and western Humanists used Wilsonian self-determination and Rooseveltian anti-colonialism. But the Soviets, guided by evil desires, twisted this into the argument that men of one race should not, under {56} any circumstances, rule over men of another race.

Since the USSR rules over many different races, it should have been relatively simple to have struck down that pernicious doctrine, but western Humanist puppets on all levels were quick to adopt the cry. And the result is that all the world today is permeated with racist animosities that exacerbate social problems in every sphere, in every area.

The Christian community of the world, splintered as it is into differing institutions and groups unable to come together even in the face of death, can certainly not bring all these problems to solution on its own.

The greatest fact, however, is that this is God's world, and God's laws cannot be violated with impunity. One is reminded of Milton's great poems, *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, in which he described the rise of Lucifer, his rebellion, the enormous number of his followers, his mighty engines of war, and his campaign against God and His Angels. In particular, Satan's Fall.

There seems no plausible way to explain the on-going collapse— at its moment of greatest power—of the Soviet and Chinese forces of anti-Christianity, except by Divine Intervention.

Almost overnight, the great monoliths, despite the support of weaklings in high office in the West, and despite their vast military and propaganda instruments, their complete control over millions of peoples except to say that the highest of all powers cannot be mocked.

They are crumbling before our eyes. The results of their vaunted economic theories have been starvation and suffering. The West is now supposed to prop these Satanic systems, but the West does not have the means to do so. Hundreds of millions can be saved only through their own efforts, and only after their terrible masters fall from power.

And it is at this time that the Christian Reconstruction movement is emerging into international recognition. There are

many different groups in the United States who had adopted the Reconstruction approach. I think it is a sign of growth that this movement has attracted powerful enemies, who have taken to print and the airways to attack us. But our mail increases, our ranks are swelling, and as aviators say once aloft, we have gone to the point of no return.

Nor are we alone. There is a religious ferment throughout the world. Inside the USSR, after over 70 years of official denial and persecution, Christianity has risen from the grave the commissars dug for it, and into which they themselves are falling. {57} It is our great favor from God, to be allowed to see the beginning of this event. We are blessed among generations. For the great forces of anti-Christianity did not come into being with Lenin, nor in this century. They have been stalking the earth since the advent of Our Lord. They appeared in the courts of the Caesars to recommend throwing Christians to the lions; they appeared as scholars and magicians in the Renaissance; they thought they had finally triumphed when Cromwell died, and when Robespierre ruled.

Never did they soar so high as in this century, and never have Christians faced such power. Yet it is crumbling. There are Bibles in Middle Europe and inside the USSR; there are millions in Africa who have lost hope in socialism and found answers in our faith.

All the problems of the modern world. racism, governmental swindlers of widows and orphans, murder in the name of virtue and pride in the name of learning are all solved inside the towering structure of Christian thought and faith.

All the innovations the world today enjoys came from the Christian civilization. V.S. Naipaul, a British writer of Hindu descent, raised in Trinidad and educated at Oxford, not too long ago made a tour among the Mohammedans of Iran, Indonesia and Pakistan. He remarked on their use of television sets and radios, jet planes and computers, automobiles and air-conditioning, and on the manner in which they send their children to the West to be educated, while accepting all these fruits of the Christian civilization as the common inheritance of the world—without once crediting the Christian civilization with its fruits.

That was, until recently, how the entire world acted. It was how the Soviets and the Chinese acted. It was how the West itself was persuaded to have contempt for itself.

But all that is changing. The great tower has cracked open, and all the world—including the prisoners inside the tower—can see the poverty within. The Grand Deceit is coming to an end; the world is beginning to realize that it has been living in the Christian civilization while doing all it could to destroy the source of its livelihood.

This revelation has not arrived as a thunderclap; it will take time to sink into the mind of the world. But it is moving—and inescapable.

Therefore we are thankful to God that today we can see the time approaching when we can say, in the words of the Old Testament, “Babylon the Great is fallen; is fallen.” {58}

What Next?

Only God knows the future, and God does not permit us to see it. This is, of course, one of His great gifts. If we could see the time and the nature of our deaths, for instance, we would watch for that day all of our lives. As it is, we are left free to enjoy the great gifts of life, with all its beauty and joys, all its challenges in large measure because of its uncertainty.

When we talk about what’s next, therefore, we are really looking at the future only from the perspective of the present moment and the probabilities it contains for the immediate prospect. After all, we cannot, within the parameters of a short life, envision a long future. We are more often surprised than proven accurate. Nobody in 1901, the first year of this century, could have possibly foreseen the carnage, the destruction, the shattered illusions, the dynastic collapses of World Wars I and II.

Today, as is usual in the final decade of a century, the air is thick with millennial gloom. With arguments that the use of oil and coal and the results of industrial processes and forests, is creating a Greenhouse Effect that is warming the globe and threatens the survival of the polar ice-caps, with consequent floods and destruction. We are told that nuclear and biological weapons in the hands of fanatics threaten all human life.

An art critic, Arthur C. Danto, has discussed “the end of art.” *The New Yorker* writer Bill McKibben has written on “The End of Nature.”

More recently American intellectuals have seized upon a brief article titled “The End of History,” written by Francis Fukuyama, a deputy director of the U.S. State Department’s Policy Planning Staff. When it appeared,⁷ the article was accompanied by “responses” from Irving Kristol, Senator Daniel Moynihan and Dr. Allan Bloom—all influential American names.

What did Fukuyama say? Essentially, he said that because the Communist mystique is fading in the Soviet Union and in Red China, that the Cold War is over, and that “western liberal democracy” has won in the struggle of ideas. He also tied this into the idea that ideological struggles will come to an end, and that “history,” as he understands the term, will also come to an end. Then, being a true bureaucrat of the intellectuals, he claims his inspiration for such a conclusion comes from Hegel.

Within weeks after its appearance, Fukuyama’s essay was extensively quoted and debated. His photograph appeared in *Time* magazine; the French quarterly *Commentaire* said it would devote an entire issue to it; BBC sent a television crew to interview the author; translation were scheduled in Dutch, Japanese, Italian and Icelandic. Ten Downing Street asked for a copy.

All this for sixteen pages! The phenomenon is remarkable enough to excuse a brief digression on the background of this young man. We discover that he is from a Christian Japanese family, that he was raised in New York City and that his father was a Congregational minister, that he attended Cornell University and became a protegee of Dr. Allan Bloom, who himself recently became famous for a book attacking the American educational system while praising the principles—if they can be called that—of Rousseau.

Fukuyama studied the Classics as an undergraduate; and comparative literature in graduate school at Yale, where one of his professors was Paul de Man, the guru of deconstructionism—that is, the theory that words really have no meaning. Then Fukuyama spent six months in Paris where he studied with Roland Barthes and Jacques Derrida—and later said he felt repelled by their intellectual nihilism.

He then entered Harvard to study Middle Eastern and Soviet

7. In *The National Interest*, Summer, 1989.

politics in the Government Department. After three years he obtained a Ph.D. in political science, with a dissertation on Soviet policy in the Middle East.

The rest was a climb through the inner passageways of government corporations and finally a post inside the State Department. His piece, "The End of History," reflects the euphoria inside Washington, which thinks the Cold War is over and that the future is rosy for the West in general and the United States in particular. There is little point in tracing the interconnections of Fukuyama's sponsors: let it suffice that they are a tight little circle known in Washington as "Neo-Conservatives."

This is a group known for its disdain for Christian Reconstruction and, indeed, for Christians and Christianity in general, whose members enjoy a disproportionate influence. Fukuyama reflects their ideas.

"For our purposes," he wrote, "it matters very little what strange thoughts occur to people in Albania or Burkina Faso." And at least one recent reviewer assessed his article as showing "a veiled contempt for the very culture whose triumphs in the political sphere it purports to celebrate."

Why spend any time on this unpleasant and shallow thinker? Where does he fit into Christian Reconstruction? Quite simply, in the enemy camp. He is mentioned because it is important to know the {60} ideas and the tactics, the connections and the maneuvers, the strategy and the efforts of such spokesmen. The appearance of a Francis Fukuyama, who is the very epitome of the polyglot American culture of today, illustrates a common American pattern. The father was a Christian minister, the son went to fashionably sectarian colleges and is now a spokesman for American Humanists.

The very title of Fukuyama's article—"The End of History"—is straight from Marx. Fukuyama speaks of "a universal homogeneous state" in which "all prior contradictions are resolved and all human needs satisfied." The struggles of life will be replaced "by economic calculations, the endless solving of technical problems, environmental concerns, and the satisfaction

of sophisticated consumer demands.”⁸

Engels said it more succinctly. “The Government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the direction of the process of production.”⁹ Marx himself said Communism is “the solution to the riddle of history.”

Nothing could more dramatically illustrate the triumph of Marxism in American education than Fukuyama’s use of Marxist and Hegelian reasoning to claim a victory over it.¹⁰

On its own this contradiction seems unusually implausible, but it is not on its own. There is much in the world today about *glasnost* and *perestroika*, which has been paraded as an end to the Cold War—or the competition between the superpowers and their respective satellites, among which we can include the nations of Europe. There is also much about the decline of the Communist mystique in Red China and the Soviet Union.

But this decline has been accompanied by the remarkable rise of a new movement, which goes by the name of Environmentalism. It has risen coincidentally with the Soviet discovery that it cannot steal western technology and apply it without creating a western infrastructure and individuality. In order to do that, the USSR would have to abandon its system of governance, and no rational person expects that to peacefully occur.

In its competition with the West, therefore, the Soviet has always understood that western technology would always stay ahead, unless some way could be found to cripple it without war.

World atheism and anti-Christianity pursued that objective through various avenues of propaganda and subversion through the years, but it was not until the beginning of the Sixties that it found the seemingly perfect tactic—one that used the strength and idealism of the West against itself, and one that could not be tangibly connected {61} to the Kremlin.

It began with the last book of a gifted nature writer named Rachel Carson. Miss Carson was dying of cancer, and—having no faith—believed that the world would die with her. In 1962 she

8. Samuel Huntington, “No Exit. The Errors of Endism,” *The National Interest*, Fall, 1989, 3–11.

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*

wrote a fantasy called *Silent Spring* about a world without birds, about a world poisoned by pesticides, strangled by pollution. In 1965 Ralph Nader wrote *Unsafe at Any Speed*, about a Detroit—the very heart of the American industrial system—dedicated to making deliberately death-trap automobiles.

These hysterical efforts emerged at a time when American courts had resumed their anti-business tilt of the Thirties, and when antitrust suits were numerous. The Health-and-Safety, Environment and Stop-Business lobbies took a quantum leap upward from the mid-1960s onward.

Paul Johnson, the British historian, wrote that these books “introduced an era in which the protection of the environment and the consumer became a quasi-religious crusade, fought with increasingly fanatical zeal,” which had “a peculiar appeal to the hundreds of thousands of graduates now pouring off campuses as a result of an expansion of higher education, eager to find ways to express the radicalism they had absorbed.

“Nothing,” he concluded, “was more calculated to produce a climate hostile to business than the growth of the health and safety lobby. It became a salient feature of American life from the mid-1960s onward, and was soon reflected in a mass of regulatory legislation.”

There is no space to mention all those measures. let it suffice to say that in their aggregate it was calculated that by 1976 they cost American business the equivalent of more than \$60 billion, and over \$100 billion by 1979.

The impact upon productivity was dramatic. Coal production fell by almost a third. Between 1967 and 1977 American productivity grew by only 27 percent, while Germany grew 70 percent, France 72 percent and Japan 107 percent. From the mid-seventies onward, American production actually declined.

The peak year of American productivity was 1968, when it made 34 percent of all the manufactured goods in the world. Twenty years later, in 1988, that ratio had fallen by half. In two decades, the United States’ productivity had shriveled, amid a flood of foreign-made goods.

But I am getting ahead of the chronology. For when the Kremlin saw the remarkable impact of environmentalism in the United States, it funded the Greens in West Germany to promote the

same set of {62} arguments, with the same anti-American tilt. Their progress has been interesting to watch. They began by combining soft pornography, as it is called, with strident environmentalism and its accompanying anti-industrialism. In a very short time they raised enough support—especially among the young and the impressionable—to operate on their own financially.

The environmental movement even managed to survive the terrible effects of the OPEC oil embargo, by claiming that it was only a ruse by the oil companies and industrialists to make more money.

But the greatest accomplishment of the movement came when the Soviet Union had to admit to the world that its domestic economy is a shambles.

Shortages of soap. Shortages of food. Shortages of housing. Shortages of health care. Shortages of every material comfort for all but the *Nomenclature*.

In this extremity, Gorbachev announced a series of relaxations. Criticism is being allowed. New publications are appearing, to a limited extent. The Black Market, according to an interesting article in *The Salisbury Review*, is being allowed to legally operate—after normal working hours and quotas are fulfilled.

Although there has been no abatement in the immense Soviet armaments industry, nor in its expansions in Africa, the Yucatan and other parts, the USSR has spouted vast streams of rhetoric about peace and cooperation.

Meanwhile, the environmental movement in the United States and through Europe has, coincidentally with the Soviet problems, taken another giant leap forward. In the last year its arguments have eerily appeared in all our publications, on all television and radio channels, in every town and city, and in all our institutions.

At the last Paris Summit, Gorbachev, together with a plea for his bloody empire to be taken into the “European family of nations,” also spoke about the need for international cooperation to “save the environment.”

Since then, a spate of articles have appeared, together with various environmental treaties, laying the groundwork for an exchange of land from Third World countries in return for the cancellation of Western loans, and for a huge new bureaucratic organization to save the earth. These steps will replace the fading

United Nations while knitting a Single World together with strands of virtue, buttressed by international regulations that will sail over national boundaries.

That is on the international level. On the American level,

} environmentalists declared that the first spate of regulations were insufficient and have demanded more and tougher laws. Lawsuits are being filed in every district against virtually every enterprise, ranging from mining to manufacturing and—this time—including service industries such as laundries and dry-cleaners, restaurants and hotels, and virtually every task that requires movement.

The latest estimates are that this flood of regulations emerging from our Congress will cost industry an additional \$60 billion a year, and wipe out tens of thousands of firms, factories and businesses.

All of this is not cited as part of a political and economic thesis; we are concerned here with Christian Reconstruction. As Christians we need to analyze events, assess their benefits, and their significance to Christianity in the world.

The environmental movement is, quite obviously, a reflection of Rousseau's argument that "our inward natures, consisting of intuition and feeling, are shared with all other living creatures and hence the belief that Man was made in the image of God is incomprehensible."¹¹

That connection is perceptive, as is the further connection, drawn by James Bowman, with the Romantics and their love of scenery, Freud's complaints about the repressions of civilization and Hitler's addiction to animals and vegetarianism.

But a friend of Chalcedon saw a return to Animism in the unending stream of "nature" propaganda funded by our government, the film and magazine industry, and even publishing.

Animism is, of course, the most primitive of religions. It sees all forms of life, poisonous snakes, insects, vultures and tse-tse flies as equally sacred and equal to Man. In Animism, all forms of life are held to possess indwelling souls. God is simply all forms of life combined.

Pantheism, in which all religions are held equal, combines the

11. James Bowman, *The Spectator*, Aug. 9, 1989.

idea, as did the Romans, that all life adds up to God. One might say that Pantheism is Animism after it goes to college.

These pagan ideas, primitive though they may sound, have never really died. When Christianity was young its believers knew the difference between Paganism and the faith; they recognized aberrant and heretical ideas when they appeared. And during times when Christianity weakens, as during the Renaissance, and the so-called Enlightenment, and in the mid-nineteenth century in Europe and the twentieth century in the United States, the old superstitions come floating back to enter the minds of the weak and the unlearned, through the persuasions of lettered and the unscrupulous.

For there is a great and enduring temptation to be influential. to take control of others, to have power over them. And in this area, {64} religion diminishes the power-hungry; reduces all men under God, and places a higher power over the open expression of earthly ambitions.

That is one of the reasons for the persistent campaign against the clergy, which seeks to remind men of God. It is one of the reasons why evil in this world always cloaks itself in goodness; always pretends to be acting on behalf of others, despite the wishes of others. "I govern," said the shameful James I of England, "not according to the common will, but the common weal."

When we see such arguments combine with ambition, and uttered by men without a belief in God, we should be wary.

This is what has emerged in Environmentalism. It has taken a sound observation, regarding our duty not to injure God's world in our efforts, and expanded it into a revival of Pantheism and Animism. The purpose of that revival, which began almost inadvertently, was to not only diminish Christianity, but to bring down the one nation where there are more churches and larger congregations than anywhere else in the world.

The greatest productive power ever known could not have been weakened and cut itself in half in two peacetime decades by any other means, than by persuading it to commit industrial suicide. The fact that this persuasion was entwined with spiritual regression made it even more effective to our enemies.

This Satanic movement was peripheral, however, until the Soviets admitted their economic disarray, and Red China made

the mistake of killing some college students in front of American TV cameras. Never mind that Beijing has mandated the deaths of one million Tibetans. College students are sacred in modern America, and their massacre ended, for a time, the American popular infatuation, despite the cynical apologies uttered by powerful men without faith.

The Soviet difficulties are more serious. They represent a public erosion of the Collectivist dreamland. And make no mistake about it, our universities have become miniature collectives. They operate as do the larger collectives, where dissent is forbidden.

They are bastions of Environmentalism, as well as bastions of Marxist and Hegelian attitudes. And as the Socialist-Marxist lure began to fade, they have moved, in uncanny unison, into Environmentalism.

Why is that? What is there about saving a rare species—an odd gesture by Darwinians who are presumably in favor of extinction in the name of Progress—that should make Marxists salivate? After all, Lenin once described Communism as Marxism with electricity. The {65} Kremlin boasted for decades about its rate of industrialization.

Well, the answer lies in regulations. The cloud of regulations raining down upon American industry will provide our bureaucracy with unlimited power to command and control. All in the name of Goodness.

While Gorbachev is claiming to decentralize (though of course he will not), we in the United States are being moved into an amazingly severe centralization.

Of course, the environment is not all that is being regulated. Child-care legislation could hatch 38,000 local day-care commissions that will determine who will be allowed to care for the children of others. That campaign against the family will cost more billions. But more importantly, it will create more regulations.

There is an “Americans with Disabilities Act” that makes it a criminal offense to tell jokes about homosexuals, or to turn a manic-depressive away from a job, or to discriminate (a word that once meant to choose) against the handicapped, who include persons with AIDS.

All these measures and more create bureaucratic jobs; all restrict

individual behavior and even individual expression. That is the important reason. That is why the environment, child-care and the needs of the handicapped call for new and sweeping measures.

The purpose is control, not improvement. Improvement is the rationale. Control is the goal.

Now, finally, we begin to see the shape of the western future, at least from Washington, D.C., and the fifty American states. Who said “democracy”—a system of succession elevated to an ideology—is winning? What is it winning?

I began with references to “The End of History.” But very little history is recalled by those who talk about its end. Russia, the argument runs, will cease to be expansionist if the West saves its murderous rulers from losing their positions. Why would that follow? Russian rulers suppressed Hungary in 1848. In 1799 Russian troops occupied Milan and Turin and fought near Zurich. They occupied the Ionian islands in 1809. They are in every continent today. Why would Russia under new rulers turn pacifist?

In 1914, wrote Professor Huntington recently, Russia directly ruled more of Europe than does Gorbachev today.

Meanwhile, let us look at Africa—north, central, and south. Are its people more free than before the Atlantic nations had colonies? No. They have less freedom. Look at Asia. Is it more free than before? Are the Chinese free without the Manchus? Is Latin America in better {66} condition without a powerful church? We see monsters murdering peasants in Peru and El Salvador, and drug lords killing judges in Colombia, shambles in Brazil and Argentina and tyranny or shameful conditions throughout other Latin American lands.

In what way is the world better because the Soviets need money? The fact is that when we see ancient superstitions rising, and governments using them as a means of increasing their power, we know that we are in a terrible time; a Time of Troubles.

We know in the United States that this has had more to do with a Christian revival than have our own efforts. We know that it is persecution that is creating believers throughout the world, and that is awakening Christian communities. But we also know that massacres of Christians continue in many places, and that restrictions on Christianity are expanding and not retreating.

We are confronted with all the instruments of propaganda, with

the misuse of inventions brought to the world by Christians, used against the Christian faith. Francis Fukuyama and his promoters are living examples of the powers and principalities we face; of the folly of men in high places.

We know that all the recent talk about peace is simply that; a world cursed and flawed cannot know peace without God.

What then is next? More of the same. This life is not a place where we shall find peace and contentment; it is a place of trial and testing. The purposes of God are unfathomable, but we know that all men; all human beings, despite their own urgings and desires, are instruments of God and are used for his purposes. And we know, because He has told us so, that all things work for those who believe.

There is much more than can be said here, but I believe Christians throughout the world will together plant the seeds of a new Reconstruction; a new Reformation, if you will, that will launch us into a great effort—an effort to change the world.

We who know how history began know equally well that it will end only when the Redeemer returns. Men cannot end history, nor can men halt the inexorable triumph of the faith no matter how many and how subtle and how often they hold aloft false gods to mislead the world. We know that the enemies of Christianity today are involved in an effort to restore Paganism, and that they will end in the same graves as the Roman despots and the tyrants of the Renaissance, the brief rulers of France during the Reign of Terror, the poseurs of the Third Reich and the bootstrap rulers of the Thirties.

Our mission is to remind the world of the faith, and to energize the faith into all the avenues of life. To rescue Christianity from the ghetto {67} and restore it to its proper place and importance in the life of the world. To help people escape from the new bondage created by new instruments of command and control. We know we shall succeed, because what will be next for us will be the proof, once again, that nobody can command and nobody can control the truth, the power, the majesty and the directions of God.

STRATEGY FOR A NEW CENTURY

William N. Blake, Ph.D.

The opportunities now at hand to reshape history far exceed our perception of what Christians can do as a small minority to redirect the destiny of nations during the twenty-first century. World systems are collapsing, and men search for better leadership. There is a strategy in Scripture sufficient to muster the full weight of Christian influence on the affairs of our day. The beauty of this strategy is that it's simple. Its simplicity is its power to move men today. It will reach the masses, for it can be understood by them and accordingly can be followed by all. Ancient Israel knew about this strategy, but it largely lay dormant in Scripture until God's judgment aroused in Israel an earnest desire to follow it. This strategy was adopted self-consciously by Israel following its Babylonian Captivity. This plan preserved that nation and gave it a respected place among the nations of its day. With this simple and powerful plan, God can do even greater things for us due to the blessings that flow from the resurrection of Christ and the mighty outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

The Israelite's plan was their creed. They called it the *SHEMA*, after the very first Hebrew word in it. It was made up of 22 Hebrew lines quoted exactly from Scripture. For us the *SHEMA* is expressed in 20 English verses. The simplicity and power of this format adopted by ancient Israel could well be the banner that leads the people of {70} God to a position of great influence in the world once again.

History tells us that the Israelites openly and universally adopted this plan following their seventy years of captivity in Babylon. Israel had witnessed many blessings from God's hand and had been miraculously delivered from its enemies on numerous occasions. The Israelites also knew the downs in life. Idolatry

frequently erupted among them and tore away their standing before God and ruptured their love of the brethren as required by the law. They knew that God had delivered them into the hands of the captors for seventy years because of uncontrolled sin in the nation. Now they were back in the land again. How could they prevent the serious errors of the past and better serve God and their fellow man in the future? They settled on a plan found in Scripture that each godly Israelite was expected to accept and to follow wholeheartedly. They no longer had the fine trappings of Solomon's Temple, nor the sole rule of their own king, nor the presence of all twelve tribes working together. Their answer for the prospect of a future with God was a united and sincere acceptance of the SHEMA. God blessed this decision and kept Israel until the coming of the Messiah and gave His people a name in the earth.

Exactly what is the SHEMA of Israel? It consists of verses taken from two parts of Deuteronomy and one portion from Numbers. The English verses are Deuteronomy 6:4–9 and 11:13–2, and Numbers 15:37–41. This creed is named after its first word, SHEMA or HEAR. "Hear, O Israel. the Lord our God is one Lord." (Deut. 6:4). You may recall that our Lord Jesus cited the first two verses of the SHEMA when he was asked by a Jewish scribe, "Which is the first commandment of all?" (Mark 12:28–30). Jesus knew the SHEMA, and above all He understood its significance in the life of a true believer.

I see the SHEMA as having five major goals or plans for our life. These five goals cover the essentials of walking with God here in this world. There are many things in life which need to be related to and governed by Scripture and developed in our lives, but one cannot easily keep all these matters before him at once. The SHEMA limits the concerns of life to an essential five. Godly Israelites surely knew there were more concerns for them than these five, but they likely understood that with these five fundamentals the rest would readily fall into place. It seems very important in raising our children that we do not over-burden them with elaborate plans for life. By giving them a few simple goals that must be accomplished, they will more readily accept these few as attainable and realistic. This is also true for the young Christian and beginning family. They must have a strategy {71} with which they can immediately identify and which they can pursue.

The *first* part of this creed, this strategy, stresses the importance of knowing God, of having correct thoughts about Who He is. The Holy Spirit has taught the church Who He is through various conflicts down through the centuries. The historic Christian creeds embody these teachings; for example, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed and the Westminster Confession of Faith. The true church of Jesus Christ has always held that the Scriptures are indeed the lifeblood of the church, but it has also learned that these systematic teachings are the arteries and veins that carry them to all parts of the body. The historic creeds of the Christian era largely teach us Who God is and what our duty is. We do well to commune with our brethren of all ages as to what they have been taught about what to believe regarding the essentials. Our children need to identify with the saints of all ages and truly practice our professed faith in the "holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints."

The *second* part of the SHEMA urges us to love God as the center and sole purpose of our life, and it tells us that our love for God must issue from our whole being. "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all they might" (Deut. 6:5). By faith in Christ and through the power of the Holy Spirit, we are enabled to do this. That, in short, means to be "born again." Only one born of God can possibly have such a sincere, strong and intelligent love. This duty that God requires of us is one that only those redeemed by Christ and filled with the Holy Spirit can in any measure perform. (See Romans 8:4.) This whole scheme of having these points worked out in our lives depends first and foremost upon God bringing us to saving faith in His Son, Jesus Christ. The entire ministry of Christ's church should lead men to truly love God. Its regular, humdrum work should seek to so proclaim the whole counsel of God that men enlarge their passion to please and to enjoy their Maker, Redeemer and Friend.

The *third* part of the plan requires us to maintain and to keep the true religion resident in our hearts and homes so that it will not wither and go to decay. God's way of doing that is for parents to train their children in the way God prescribes. Education that is not centered in the Bible is not endorsed by God. God requires of parents to provide a law structure for the lives of their children.

That law structure must be “these words, which I command you...” (Deut. 6:6). The SHEMA refers to the Ten Commandments in particular and in general to the whole of God’s revelation available at that time. For us, it means all of Scripture, the whole Bible. Thank God for a complete revelation! The {72} Ten Commandments remain today as a brief account of God’s order for our lives as well as a display of His holiness. They serve as a summary of how a Christian is to live and to love God. Jesus said, “If ye love me, keep my commandments” (John 14:16). This divine pattern for our lives points the way to attain self-fulfillment because we were made to glorify God and imitate His holiness in our daily walk.

This third aspect of God’s plan is the first bit of social action in this five-point scheme. The first two deal with our personal relationship with God. Having effected the first two, a person is then ready to engage in rebuilding life in this world to the glory of God. That first step forward, that first outgoing action to make a better world, must receive the highest priority and the greatest energy of all social actions. Having a duty to train children, of course, implies a prior commitment to one’s spouse. These comments on training children do not overshadow the central importance of a godly marriage. Marriage and the training of children cannot be readily separated. They form a single bond. One can think of many things for a Christian to do in order to bring all things under the dominion of Christ. But where do you begin? What must not be left undone? The SHEMA places the godly training of children at the top of the list. God gave priority to the teaching ministry when He established a pattern for the distribution of His tithe. The tithe went first to the teaching Levites; they then paid a tithe of that to the priestly Levites at Jerusalem. (See Neh. 10:38 and Num. 18:26). In this way, God underscores the central importance of the teaching ministry in His kingdom. Without accepting this priority, the rest of God’s work for us in this world will not result in the long-term effects of building a Christian community locally and worldwide.

God gave Abraham a special place in His kingdom because God knew that Abraham would “command his children and his household after him” (Genesis 18:19). Abraham was the founder of a great nation, a people free to obey God and to realize accordingly their highest and greatest potential in this life.

The Christian education of our children in the home and in the school is the very foundation of a nation that hopes to enjoy the freedom and blessings promised by Scripture. People today cry for democracy. Do they understand that a viable democracy can only arise out of a return to God's rule for family life. If they think democracy is simply a political arrangement, they will in time be greatly disappointed. The editors of the *Reader's Digest* assess this current outcry for democracy and they speak of democracy and America's "sacred fire" that has inspired and given hope to the oppressed people of the earth. These editors, however, see democracy in America as the outgrowth of family life and faith in God and not merely as a political arrangement:

What will enable this unlikely alliance of quite average human beings to hold high the sacred fire?

Throughout history, ordinary Americans have known instinctively that it is spiritual and moral resources, far more than material ones, that build a nation. Across the wide miles, countless individual families have gone about the quiet business of creating and re-creating the country's soul. It is far too rarely noted that the astonishing collective achievements of this land have their deepest roots in the plain, unassuming lessons parents and teachers have repeated again and again to young children. Do what's right. Tell the truth. Help your neighbor. Learn as much as you can. Follow your dreams. When hardship comes, have courage, and trust in God. If you fail, try again. Above all, never, ever, give up ("Freedom On The March," *Reader's Digest*, Jan. 1990, 34).

Who can revitalize the family and keep it intact? Only true believers can do this. In order to rebuild America or any other nation, we must have a plan that all Christians can and must follow. The SHEMA says that the most crucial strategy for social action, for the reconstruction of society, is the godly education of our children. We must fight ungodly laws today and other political, legal and social evils, but a victory over these in themselves will not rebuild America or any other nation. We must abandon the idolatrous practice of allowing our children to be taught by the ungodly in ways that are clearly against what God prescribes. Why is abortion practiced so widely today? Because our youth have not been taught at home or at school the law of God by precept or by example. Thank God for the 30 to 35 percent of all students

in America today (and others in other countries) who receive a Christian education either in their home or at a Christian school. Let us pray for the day when the vast majority of children are taught in terms of God's standards and not by the humanistic standards of the state. In this way, Christians can provide the essential ingredient to restore to their nations solid and viable families. By this action on the part of American Christians, this nation can then point the way to a world-wide community in which each man is increasingly learning to be self-governed by the law and gospel of Jesus Christ. {74}

The scheme we adopt for our lives should, in turn, influence the kind of missionary effort we support. The work of missionaries should be aimed at more than saving a man's soul. Every soul saved will do something with his life. What will it be? Missionaries should challenge these new converts with the uplifting and nation-building scheme of the SHEMA. Converts should not become wards of the mission effort nor of a state system of education, but they should begin little by little building their own system of Christian education. These young Christians should learn to fund these schools with God's tithe in the same way ancient Israel funded its teachers and accordingly established its educational system after the Babylonian Captivity. (*See Nehemiah 10:38; 12:44; 13:5, 12, 13; Num. 18:26 and Deut. 33:10*). People can thus build their educational system and culture in terms of God's blessing on them. In this way their unique contribution to world culture will be secured. They will not become captives of western culture, but they will develop their own future in terms of our common faith. There can be true unity among men in terms of our faith, but there can also be a rich diversity among people which is an expression of God's providential dealing with each group.

Our plan of action should influence the church we join. The church should have a plan of instruction for children above and beyond the usual Sunday school curriculum. The plan should involve the parents in biblical instruction in the home with the church guiding the program. The plan should include instruction in one of the historic catechisms of the church. The Westminster Shorter Catechism, as a teaching device covering the basics of biblical teaching, stands as one of the greatest in my estimation. Use the one your church supports. When a church and parents

work together in harmony, a solid foundation for unity and peace and the advance of the gospel are secured. The church must stand again in the eyes of men as a solid rock in the midst of the swirling tides of human history. By taking seriously the SHEMA, churches can again be that light and that salt which men in the world desperately need.

The SHEMA points very strongly towards the necessity of home education. Every Christian home is a home school for God whether the children receive formal educational training at home or at a school. The command is to saturate your home with the knowledge of God's ways. No activity in the home can be excluded from the demands of Scripture. The Scriptures are to be bound as "a sign upon thine hand and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes." (Deut. 6:8) In other words, our hands, the work of our hands, our training and our talents, must be governed by Scripture. Also all that {75} enters our minds must be judged and evaluated by Scripture. The mind is thus under the control of the Bible at all points. Then, if our youth are to counter Satan's temptation, they can begin to realize and to practice what our Lord said, "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4).

Think about the words of the prophet Malachi whereby he foretold the mission of John the Baptist, who was to prepare the way for the coming of Christ, our Lord. The prophet sets forth John's task in simple but arresting terms. "And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse" (Malachi 4:6; cf. Luke 1:17). The very heart of John's ministry centered upon restoring the apparent breach between father and son. Fathers simply were not doing their job. It seems that God the Father would not allow His Son to begin His ministry upon earth until certain preparations were accomplished. The required preparation involved a healing of the father-son relationship in the home. John preached repentance and demanded the fruits of repentance. What fruit did Malachi indicate was imperative in order for the blessings of the Incarnate One to appear? There were many sins in Israel at that time. John zeroed in on the most crucial error; namely, fathers weren't loving their children as God required nor were the children loving their fathers rightly. The SHEMA shows

how to love children. John also admonishes children to do their part. The key, however, lies with the fathers. C.S. Lewis speaks of George MacDonald's childhood in terms reminiscent of the SHEMA and of what Malachi requires:

An almost perfect relationship with his father was the earthly root of all his wisdom. From his own father, he said, he first learned that Fatherhood must be at the very core of the universe. He was thus prepared in an unusual way to teach that religion in which the relation of Father and Son is of all relations the most central (C. S. Lewis, *George MacDonald*, xxi).

Sermons related to this part of John the Baptist's mission are greatly needed today as we witness before our very eyes a substantial number of families where a destructive rift tears children and their fathers apart. The very foundation of God's government on earth is accordingly ravaged. The peculiar essence of repentance is to repair this breach. Fathers, have you truly made peace with your God, with the ruler of all nations? Consider Malachi's definition of repentance to {76} determine if the Holy Spirit has worked in your heart.

The heavenly host broadcast the benefits of Christ's birth from the sky over the hills of Judea saying, "...on earth peace, good will toward men" (Luke 2:14). Our Lord Jesus Christ firmly established His everlasting kingdom during His lifetime with sincere intent to bring the benefits of His Incarnation to men on earth. That kingdom had its impact first on earth. All believers from Adam on down knew that its climax would be realized in heaven. However, benefits do accrue to men now. These benefits are what every man in his heart would like to enjoy; namely, peace on earth, where men share in the good will of Christ toward men. People time and time again look for spectacular events like mass revivals, revolutions or great moral and political reforms to usher in peace and good will. God's methods and actions seldom make the headlines. It is my opinion that God's principle strategy for advance is outlined in the SHEMA. The role of the father in the home is pivotal in bringing the benefits of the Incarnation to all men. A father is the sovereign, under God, in his domain, the family. A father that self-consciously adheres to the SHEMA is bringing to earth the kingdom of God and peace and good will toward men. As the number of redeemed and restored families increase on the earth, the real and

effective kingdom of Christ multiplies; societies, governments and cultures begin to absorb these benefits; and the visibility of Christ's dominion on the earth approaches what the Bible says. "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end" (Isa. 9:7). The Bible speaks of this role of the father as the head of his family in terms of an elder. Those who had succeeded in leading their families in accordance with divine commands became the elders of Israel. This idea of eldership is at the root of democracy in Christian lands. If America or any other nation is to be reconstructed along biblical lines, such a condition will not arise from political arrangements but only from faithful elders in the homes. Elders in the church are drawn from such godly homes. (See 1 Timothy 3:1-7). Likewise, those who rule in the state should come from among the faithful elders. By doing this, we pattern our political decisions for leadership after Scripture. (See Num. 11:16; Deut. 19:11, 12 and Matt. 16:21. For an extended and challenging discussion of eldership, see R.J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law*, 739-751, and *Law and Society*, 367-370, 656-661.) Our strategy for the rebuilding of America is not primarily political or social, but it is simply a return to the biblical idea of the family and of the father. The church's principle mission is to create and strengthen this kind of home. At least the prophet Malachi linked the advance of {77} the kingdom to this simple plan. (See Malachi 4:6.)

To order our family life in the way Scripture requires seems to be a task far beyond anyone's singular ability. Yes, that is true. That is why the church has such a vital and complementary role in executing such a life plan. There should be timely and authoritative preaching on the general scheme and themes of the SHEMA. This kind of prophetic ministry of God's word will be a united consensus among believers. It will encourage families to help one another in this earth-shaking task. Common prayers for one another will strengthen our feeble efforts. Parents now often stand alone in their churches in order to carry out God's best for their family. Seventy to eighty percent of all Christian homes, it is estimated, still send their children for formal education to a system not sanctioned by God. What would happen to our nations if the pulpits began to teach the SHEMA authoritatively as God's one and only plan for Christians to follow? The results would be

staggering. There would be a historic revival of proportions never before witnessed on the earth. Abortion-on-demand would soon become illegal. The banking system and the super rich would no longer control the economic future of our people. The Bible would, in time, become the sole foundation of law in our localities, in our states or provinces and in our national governments. Missionaries would go to the ends of the earth bringing the gospel of Jesus Christ which can change the lives of men and thus enable them to seize upon God's scheme for their everyday labors. Would you like to live in such a world? We can, or our posterity can, if we as God's people repent and begin wholeheartedly taking that first step in social action; namely, to train our children in the fear and admonition of the Lord. (See Eph. 6:4.)

The *fourth* feature of this plan is found in the second passage, Deut. 11:13–21. Our duty emphasized here is to provide for our family's economic security. Does that mean training for the best job available? Does it mean saving all the money we can for future needs? Does it mean being clever in investments and business dealings? Or does it mean establishing a state system of economic security? Neither capitalism nor socialism is the answer. The biblical answer in the SHEMA is simple. It doesn't even look like an economic plan. The SHEMA says it in plain and simple words anyone can follow. obey God's laws and God will bless the labor of your hands. If you refuse to obey His law, then God will remove His blessing from you. *Here we have the best theory of economics in the world!* I can see that the Bible tends to favor the capitalistic theory, but capitalism in itself provides no more economic security for men than does {78} socialism. Only when God is at the center of our economic lives can we realize the economic stability promised by Scripture.

This passage on economic security is the longest passage in the SHEMA. God has no small concern for our economic well-being. The Puritans who followed the Pilgrims to Massachusetts brought with them much of the wealth of England and accordingly firmly established the future of the colonies. It is thought that a fourth part of the riches of the kingdom would have passed out of it through this channel if the persecution of the Puritans had continued twelve years longer. (See *The Christian History of the Constitution of the United States of America*, vol. 1, 181.) The Puritans sought

zealously to live in terms of Scripture and God blessed their efforts with economic stability and the founding of a great nation. Also in this longer section of the SHEMA, the call to educate the youth is repeated. People see the connection today between education and economic prosperity, but they fail to understand that economics outside of God's law fails in time. God judges those who walk apart from His law. How can we best secure God's blessing on our economic future? By training our children in God's ways! We can see how the havoc of sinful ways has affected our youth today. Those tragic everyday stories of wrecked young lives do not need repeating.

The *fifth* plan of action in the SHEMA centers on our attitude toward life. For the Jews, this required, in Numbers 15:37–41, that a blue fringe be attached to their garments. God said this fringe was a symbol of His law. Whatever we do in life we are never to walk beyond the blue fringe on our garments or walk outside the boundaries of God's law. Others will see this blue fringe. They will know that our lifestyle is characterized by obedience to what God says. We do not enjoy, as true believers, operating beyond the limitations of His word. We enjoy the identity of God's mark upon us. Our whole outlook and outreach in life is marked by joyful compliance to the whole will of God. We have not put new wine into old bottles. There is integrity, sincerity and contentment accompanying our whole manner of living.

In review, the SHEMA only places two requirements upon all of us for social action. One is in the educational field so that our religion is preserved on the earth and God's kingdom is accordingly advanced. The other is in the economic realms where we are expected to achieve economic security by obedience to God's law. The other three parts of the scheme deal with personal discipline and holiness. There are many demands upon Christians today to be active in society. All these programs have merit. We shouldn't consider any of {79} these—missions, benevolence, political, legal and social causes—of little importance. The question facing a Christian today is this. what is the rock bottom minimum I must do to please God and be certain I will leave the world in better shape than when I was born. The ancient church chose the SHEMA as its united plan of action. What kind of modern church could we have today if we unitedly sought to follow this ancient creed?

What kind of nation would we in time build? Only God knows the answers fully, but it seems certain that God promises great blessings to those who adopt this plan from their heart.

LORD OF LIFE

The Confession of Lordship and Saving Faith

Joseph P. Braswell

The so-called Christian Reconstruction movement, with its insistence on *theonomy*, is based upon the centrality of the Lordship of Christ. A good deal of the opposition to theonomy and reconstruction stems from the deficient evangelical understanding of Christ's Lordship. There are basic trends in much of evangelicalism which tend to relegate the Lordship of Christ to the periphery of soteriology as incidental to saving faith. Indeed, some quarters even go beyond this, tending to view it as merely an *optional* decision—a *voluntary* response of gratitude with no necessary connection to faith. The *command* to repent, to obey the gospel and respond to the presence of the Kingdom of God, is a lost emphasis in preaching and evangelism. Lordship-confession is not considered to be of the *essence* of faith; it is at best merely the fruit of faith which just sort of appears inevitably—automatically—from our passivity.

In stark contrast to this, theonomic reconstruction sets faith in antithesis to humanism, to anthropocentric arrogance exalted against God. Faith stands against all expression of man's enmity against God wherein man presumptively, high-handedly attempts to usurp God's {82} Kingdom and rebelliously declares his own autonomy and will to be as God. The pretense of autonomy, self-exaltation and *hubristic* insurrection, *not* good works of our obedience, are what stand diametrically opposed to faith. The contrast is between the mutually exclusive principles of theonomy and autonomy, between covenant-keeping and covenant-breaking, between the two basic religious loves characteristic of the city of God and the city of man. Faith is the radical reorientation of

human existence. It is the redirection of the human heart—which is the religious root of human existence and seat of the image of God—toward God in unconditional surrender. Faith is that basic commitment of a King’s subject which finds in the reign of God the *summum bonum*. It recognizes, confesses and submits wholeheartedly to the Lord as Sovereign Master and Owner Who has bought us and made us His by placing His yoke upon us. The *theocentric* vision which flows from understanding this places *comprehensive* salvation before us, “the crown rights of King Jesus,” which is the hallmark of the reconstructionists’ manifesto of dominion and postmillennial hope, a faith which remains incomprehensible to the standard evangelical vision of salvation.

Because faith recognizes the Lordship of Christ, it must be a conquering, *dominion* faith which confidently asserts that Lordship in every sphere of life. Faith energizes us with the confidence to extend the Kingdom vision, to work out and practice that Lordship, to challenge all idol-lords. Faith views the commands of the Lord as the way of covenant life, as wisdom-instruction for dominion over sin and as applicable to the redemption of creation from the effects of the curse caused by rebellion from the authority of the Lord.

What is needed today is an accent upon the centrality of Christ’s Lordship in salvation, a reorientation which underscores Lordship-confession as being of the very *essence* of saving faith. This essay is a beginning in such theological reconstruction.

Beginning with baptism, which is foundational to defining the response of faith, we must then turn to deal with some of the faulty presuppositions which have tended to obscure this perspective. From there, we must frankly face the inadequacies of traditional Reformed thought in effectively challenging those presuppositions. This is because some aspects of traditional Reformed thinking includes confusing formulations which are not equipped to confront “easy-believis” antinomianism. The need to examine our traditional heritage necessitates a return to Paul and a process of reformulation. {83}

Baptism and Lordship

“Jesus is Lord.” This was perhaps the very first confessional formula of the Christian church.¹ It was a confession of *faith* made by the recipient of the sacrament of baptism. Upon this confession of the Lordship of Jesus, the judgment was made by the church and its leaders that there was nothing to hinder the subject’s being baptized,² that baptism was to be allowed because only by operations of the Spirit of God could the Lordship of Christ be recognized and proclaimed.³ By virtue of this confession, therefore, the sacrament of baptism was administered. Pre-eminently, then, this Lordship-confession was the expression of baptismal faith, covenantal response to God’s offer and action in the covenant of baptism. the application of salvation.⁴

Baptism was the initiatory sign and seal of the covenant God had fulfilled in Christ. The baptized had put on Christ, been united to Him and incorporated into Him, thereby participating in and with Him in the great eschatological salvation-event wrought by God in Christ. Baptism placed the recipient under Christ’s Lordship, under His authority and jurisdiction. By baptism, the subject had entered within the sphere of Jesus’s dominion as one belonging to the Lord, a bearer of the yoke of Christ. Now he bears the mark of Christ and the Name of Jesus, as one bearing the seal of

1. Cf. e.g., Alan Richardson, ‘Creed, Creeds,’ *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Worship*, ed. J.G. Davies (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1972), 156.

2. Oscar Cullman, *Baptism in the New Testament*, trans. J.K.S. Reid (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, n.d.), 71. 80.

3. Cf. I Cor. 12:3b; note importance of Spirit-manifestations in Acts 10:4–48 (11:15–17).

4. The terminology of the ‘application of salvation’ is used in deference to the historico-theological tradition which distinguishes between the application of redemption by the Spirit in the dimension of the life-experience of the believer commencing with his conversion and the accomplishment of redemption which was the once-for-all completed and definitive, historical act of God in Christ. Conceptually, however, the ideas of application and receiving can be somewhat misleading, for salvation is not a *thing* but an event—*saving-activity*. The ‘application’ is not really a bestowing of a gift-object to be possessed, but is rather the causing to participate in what has been accomplished. One is united to Christ and thereby incorporated into His history, in and with Christ participating in the historical saving activity. The significance of this point will become clear subsequently.

ownership, the brand of His master. This is his mark of identity as a bond-servant, as one who is crucified to the world and the world to him, as one who follows Christ in cross-bearing discipleship, as one who continues in the word of Christ, doing the will of the Father by faithful commandment-keeping.

To receive baptism is to accept the judgment of God in His covenant lawsuit against the world, to publicly side with God in this eschatological verdict leveled against the rebel forces, though this is an admission of one's own culpable participation in the enmity and insurrection.⁵ To receive baptism is, therefore, an expression of radical repentance and the acknowledgment of the just claims of God upon and against the world; it is a witness for the prosecution, testifying for the vindication of God. Baptism represents a coming under the ordeal of judgment, plunging penitently headlong into the wrath of God revealed in His eschatological judgment in the Day of the Lord at the coming of the Kingdom. The waters of baptism are waters of judgment and ordeal, yet the baptized has penitently surrendered unconditionally and sworn an oath of allegiance to His Suzerain, hoping in promised mercy for deliverance through the {84} waters for those who are the people of God's possession. By the Spirit of grace, their baptism is identified with the baptism-ordeal of Christ and they—in, with, and under Him—are redeemed from death and pass into the life of the eschatological Kingdom by the resurrection of Christ. Those who have passed into the Kingdom have been translated into the sphere in which Christ's Lordship is willingly, consciously acknowledged and practiced in newness of life as a slave of God unto righteousness.

Because Christ's life-giving Spirit proceeds from His position as the highly exalted Lord and Savior, it is in Him that the waters of judgment have become waters of cleansing. It is in Him that God's Spirit becomes effused upon those who are His. Christ has taken the baptism of John, a baptism of repentance and preparation administered in advance of the coming of Christ's Kingdom, and He has transformed it into Messianic baptism. The Messiah does not administer a symbol, but pours out the Spirit in His baptism.

5. Meredith G. Kline, *By Oath Consigned* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), *passim*.

As the Resurrected One, He has become life-giving, and the Holy Spirit is the Medium of that life. Christ sent forth the Spirit to His Church on the day of Pentecost to baptize His people. The church thus becomes the locus of the Spirit, the Temple-body indwelt by the Spirit of Christ. This church was commissioned by the risen Christ, to Whom all power and authority in heaven and earth had been given, to baptize, accompanied by the promise of the presence of Christ. Thus, the baptism administered by the Christian church is no mere water baptism, a *signa nuda* on the same level with John's baptism, set in contrast to, and as but symbol of, Holy Spirit baptism; the church administers the baptism of its Lord and Head, by His authority. It is an efficacious sealing act of the two-edged sword of the covenant unto blessing or cursing, unto the Holy Spirit or fiery judgment which will consume the adversary, depending on whether one is faithful or unfaithful to the Lord of the covenant. It is not merely the lip-service of calling Christ "Lord" which avails, but the doing of God's will which practices that Lordship.

In current ecclesiastic polity, baptism is often delayed; it comes some time after one is supposedly "born again." It is often viewed as a subsequent act of dedication, something, to some extent, distinct from and in addition to the simple faith of conversion. Even apart from the interpretation of baptism that would make it a human work offered to God (self-dedication) and the idea that this commitment is somehow separable from new birth and salvation, the polity itself is regrettable. The early church baptized immediately upon confession of faith in *Kyrios Christos*; upon such confession, nothing else {85} hindered baptism. The delay obscures the fact that, as Norman Shepherd points out, baptism should be seen covenantally as the moment of transition from death to life.⁶ This is so clear from the Scriptures (Rom. 6:3ff; Gal. 3:28; Col. 2:12) that it takes sophistic exegetical gymnastics to avoid it. To receive baptism is to be covenantally joined to Christ as a member of His Body, under His Headship; it is to bear the Name, to be covenantally adopted as a son and heir with all attendant

6. "The Covenant Context for Evangelism," in John Skilton, ed. *The New Testament Student*, vol. 3. *The New Testament Student and Theology* (n.p., Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1976), 66-75.

privileges and duties. Baptism bestows relationship. the common practice, however, seems to create the anomaly in which faith is divorced from covenantal response and conversion is a simple trust in Christ as Savior which is separated from submission to Him as Lord. Faith has been abstracted from the covenant of God and is not viewed as covenant response to the covenant Lord.

More serious, however, is the perception of baptism fostered by such a polity, which sees baptism as a human offering to God, for baptism is the work of God in applying what He has accomplished in Christ. It is the promise offered for personal appropriation, a thing to be received by response to the demand of the covenant, by the “amen” to the claims of God as covenant Lord. Yes, this covenantal response is indeed an oath sworn to serve the covenant Lord in humble submission and faithful allegiance; it is a dedication and commitment. This is, however, the human response of covenant faith; baptism itself is the revelation of the righteousness of God, coming in eschatological judgment to save or destroy, and our response is but our acknowledgment and acceptance of the claims of God—a response to the proclamation of the Kingdom and its radical demand upon us. The covenantal response demanded of us when so confronted is to repent, to seek first and foremost the Kingdom, to be theocentric in all of thought and life, bringing every thought captive to the obedience of Christ, to love the Lord with all our heart, mind, soul and strength, cleaving to the Lord and pledging, “All that the Lord has commanded us we will do.” The gospel proclaims that Jesus is Lord; baptismal faith is the *amen* to this proclamation.⁷

The Loss of Perspective

It follows, therefore, that baptismal faith is not a subsequent act of dedication, something distinct from saving faith. It is gospel response; it is saving faith as response to the gospel of the *Kingdom*. Two errors have tended to obscure the significance of this realization. The first is the dispensationalists’ attempt to draw a distinction {86} between the gospel of the Kingdom and

7. Cf. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973), III, 589.

the gospel of grace.⁸ The second is the nominalistic attempt to atomize the existential response of faith into abstractly isolated moments, only one of which can function strictly and properly as the instrument for receiving salvation. The dispensationalists' dichotomy, were it true, would mean that, while the gospel of the Kingdom puts forth this legal demand for radical repentance and commitment, there is an antithesis between law and grace such that the gospel of grace calls only for accepting the free gift of salvation by trusting Christ as Savior (not Savior *and Lord*) without any demands or conditions. In this scheme, the gospel of the Kingdom means that God is coming to judge and destroy His enemies, while the gospel of grace announces that Christ has died to redeem sinners and reconcile God's enemies to Him if they will but believe. The dichotomy founders upon more than a few proof-texts;⁹ it misinterprets the very biblical-theological structure of the

8. Cf. the note in the *New Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 1366. Scofield sees the gospel of the Kingdom as the message that God intends to set up an earthly, millennial kingdom centered in Jerusalem. This proclamation to the Jews, begun by John and Jesus, was abruptly cut off when the Jews rejected Jesus' offer to be their King, and this kingdom was postponed until after the Church Age, subsequent to which Christ comes again. Accordingly, the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom is quite out of place in this age; it is only to be resumed during the Great Tribulation period, following the Rapture. In this intercalary parenthesis age, it is supplanted by the very different message of Paul's gospel of grace which does not focus on the prophetic hope of Israel, but has as its content the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus as the basis for justification and eternal life to individuals from all nations (*ibid.*).

9. The Pauline epistles use the terminology of the Kingdom at times (Rom. 14:17; 1 Cor. 4:20; 6:9:10; 15:24; Gal. 5:21; Eph. 5:5; Col. 1:13; 4:11; , Thess. 2:12; 2 Thess. 1:5). John's Gospel connects the idea of regeneration and eternal life to individual believers with entry into the Kingdom in John 3:3ff. Of greater interest, however, are the statements in Acts (14:22; 19:8; 20:25; 28:23, 31), which, by author Luke's conscious design, serve as a bridge of continuity between the proclamation of the Kingdom in Jesus' earthly ministry (as recorded in Luke's Gospel—e.g., 11:20; 12:22; 17:20–21; 22:29), that preached by the original apostles in the Jewish church, and that preached by Paul to Jews and Gentiles. The post-Easter instruction of the Risen Christ to His disciples concerning the Kingdom (Acts 1:3) connects the gospel proclaimed in the earthly ministry of Jesus to the apostolic *kerygma* (cf. Acts 8:12) and the connection of this proclamation with Paul is made clear by the identical wording of 8:12 and 20:25, where Paul identifies the proclamation of the Kingdom as the whole counsel of God and the gospel of God's grace (see Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., "The Whole Counsel of God," in John H. White, ed. *The Book of Books* [Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1978], 19–28).

New Testament witness to the work of Christ.¹⁰

Sadly, some non-dispensationalists—those interpreters who would emphatically reject Scofield’s chiliastic notes about separate purposes and peoples and parenthetic ages—make the mistake of defining the Kingdom so “spiritually” that they totally miss the prophetic-apocalyptic note of eschatological, cosmic triumph that the concept communicated in context to the original audience. With a truncated concept of the Kingdom, they can identify it with their narrow and individualistic conception of grace and salvation. Rather than illuminating the pregnant meaning of God’s great saving activity, the Kingdom is reduced to the impoverished conception of salvation which plagues modern American evangelicalism. There is an irony here. the dispensationalist has a narrow, spiritualized, individualistic, internalized and pietistic

10. The dispensationalists provide us with a promise/postponement scheme for understanding the relation of the O.T. and the N.T.. what was promised in the old covenant and constituted Israel’s prophetic hope has been postponed for the duration of the Church Age, an age standing in discontinuity with that hope as something unforeseen and of disparate purpose. The New Testament, without the dispensationalist *a priori* imposition, projects a promise/fulfillment scheme, but one modified by the twin aspects of ‘already’ and ‘not yet’: accomplishment hidden in Christ at the First Advent, though progressively revealed by the Spirit of Christ on an ‘earnest’ level during the course of this age, and the full, consummate disclosure of that which was realized in Christ when He comes again.

Herman N. Ridderbos has characterized Paul’s proclamation as the arrival of the eschatological time of salvation in Christ (*Paul. An Outline of His Theology*, trans. John Richard De Witt [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974], 44, 47f). Paul’s proclamation in Romans of the ‘righteousness of God’ is simply another way of speaking of the Kingdom of God, merely emphasizing somewhat more by this particular expression that the eschatological activity of God is His *faithfulness* in fulfilling the promise of the Kingdom as the establishment of the righteous reign of God with the power to destroy all opposing powers of enmity, to deliver and liberate His people from all that oppresses and enslaves them, to right creation and bring peace.

In John’s Gospel, the presence of the Kingdom is manifested in the present enjoyment by those who have received the Spirit from the glorified King Jesus of the eschatological life of the age to come (*aionic* life)—(John 3; 7:38–39). John particularly emphasizes that Jesus rejected the Jewish offer of Kingship (*not*, contra the dispensationalists, *vice-versa*—cf. 6:15) and that His Kingdom was not postponed by His crucifixion, but was so established (3:14–15; 12:31–33; 13:31–32). Moreover, even in Matthew’s Gospel, (the darling of the dispensationalists), the taking of the Kingdom from the Jews is not a postponement, but a giving of it to others (Matt 21:43; 8:11–13) and, on this basis, I Peter 2:9 can apply it to the new people of God.

conception of New Testament salvation and cannot reconcile this with the Old Testament roots of the Kingdom concept, so he posits a dichotomy; many non-dispensationalists share this “fundamentalist” soteriology and so they simply reject the Old Testament content of the Kingdom concept as “Jewish” (as opposed to their own Hellenism) and redefine the Kingdom in terms of their impoverished soteriology as a “kingdom of grace.” The gospel of the Kingdom stands as a radical challenge to cheap grace, easy-believism and antinomianism, because in it one is confronted by the Lord Who has come to exercise His Kingly prerogatives and rule in power and might as One Who commands that all men repent, that every knee bow and every tongue confess that our God reigns. It is the end of the anthropocentrism and humanism that has adulterated our understanding of the gospel, for its vision of {87} soteriology is thoroughly theocentric.

The second error which serves to obscure the content of faith as Lordship-confession is a peculiar concern with some instrumental function of an isolated historical moment as the beginning of faith. The problem is that this concern tends to reduce the other aspects of faith to unimportant incidentals. The question of why faith serves as the means to appropriate salvation attempts to focus on how faith is suited to function in this receptive capacity. Why is faith, rather than love, repentance, or good works, able to serve instrumentally? There may be much to the concrete faith-act which is extraneous to this function, which is no more suitable to this receptive capacity than are love and repentance; we are narrowly focusing on an isolated abstraction, not living faith. The question has relevance only when addressing the narrow theological problem of legalistic works-righteousness and when debating the meritorious ground of salvation.

Therefore, the question already assumes an instrument/ground distinction which means that faith is not a contributive cause of our salvation, a way of appropriating a salvation which is grounded in something else. Faith must be rescued from the idea of *congruent merit*; its non-meritorious nature must be defended.¹¹ Christ is

11. Congruent merit (as opposed to *condign*) merit—the merit of strict justice and recompense according to inherent value) in Roman Catholic theology may be described as a merciful reckoning of a virtuous act or good work to be worth more than it actually is in and of itself. our “two cents worth” is, by the goodness

the ground of salvation; He provides the meritorious basis for salvation by His satisfaction (active and passive obedience) of the law's demands, which, according to strict justice, *earns* the right to life and glory. Faith does not merit salvation, does not belong to, nor contribute in any way to the ground of salvation. It is a channel through which the benefits of that ground are applied—a receptacle. As the suitable ground is *solo Christo*, so the suitable instrument is *sola fide*, because faith is unique—it *alone* can serve this function.

In the Reformation debates, soteriology focused on justification by faith. This was the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*. Justification was a forensic declaration of righteous status whereby the guilty sinner was pardoned and pronounced in right standing with God solely for Christ's sake, based upon the imputation of an "alien" righteousness wrought by Christ. Accordingly, justifying faith was conceived *first* as involving an *understanding* of the ground of salvation. that it was wholly *extra nos*, solely Christ and the merits of His work. *Second*, justifying faith *assents* to the sufficiency of that ground and thereby renounces any necessity of human efforts to contribute to this ground. *Third*, saving faith is a *dependence* upon the efficacy, value, and sufficiency of the ground of Christ's {88} righteousness, relying solely upon Him alone. Justifying faith was a suitable instrument precisely because it was passive and receptive; it was renunciation of all hope in one's own resources and strength, a casting away of any self-grounded claims, a reaching outside, beyond oneself, to rest in—ground one's hope in and find security in—another basis. The essence of faith is its own emptiness, its own non-contributory character of casting itself upon something deemed trustworthy. It

of God, counted by Him as comparable to a million dollars, because the attitude evinced by such virtuous effort, in willingness to cooperate with and obey God, is rewarded most generously as a suitable and appropriate reason for the bestowing of grace. Albeit imperfectly, congruent merit does *qualify* one for grace; it does contribute something—to the meritorious ground of justification. The Protestant concern to distinguish the uniqueness of faith's function as instrumental cause from other Spirit-wrought graces of evangelically obedient response and to oppose any conception of faith (with or without the accompanying graces) being counted as the righteousness of justification is expressed in W.C.F., XI:I ("Of Justification"). "...He also freely justifieth. not...by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness..."

is this unique function, rather than its character as an obedient response (the characteristic of other evangelical graces Spiritually wrought within us), which is at the forefront in correlating faith and justification.

The focus is therefore upon appropriation of the alien righteousness which, when imputed as one's own by Divine reckoning, serves as the suitable ground of justification. The gospel promise *graciously* offers entitlement to claim this righteousness of Christ as one's own, in order that it may be so credited in the Divine reckoning. Faith hears and believes this offer of entitlement and depends upon the suitability of this righteousness as a fit ground for meriting a declaration of righteousness in the sight of God. Faith receives the entitlement, claims that to which it is thereby entitled; it is confident that the deed of entitlement will "hold up in court."

This is what distinguishes faith from other "graces" like repentance, love, and obedience. These can be responses to the gospel; they may even be required and necessary responses; but they cannot function in the capacity of faith as appropriation. The Reformers who so adamantly contended for *sola fide* were equally emphatic in asserting that the faith which alone justifies is never alone, but is always accompanied by such graces as repentance, love, and obedience.¹² This, unfortunately, is something their self-professed heirs frequently have forgotten and which we must

12. As cited by Benjamin Drewery in Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, ed., *A History of Christian Doctrine* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1978), 325, Luther wrote. "O, it is a living, busy, active, mighty thing this faith; and so it is impossible for it not to do good works incessantly....and thus it is impossible to separate works from faith, quite as impossible as to separate heat and light from fire." Calvin, in his *Commentaries on the First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, Vol. II, trans. Thomas Myers (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, rep. 1979), 238, makes the following comments upon Ezekiel 18:14-17: "Thus it still remains true, that faith without works justifies, although this needs produced and a sound interpretation; for this proposition, that faith without works justifies is true and yet false, according to the different senses it bears. The proposition that faith without works justifies by itself is false, because faith without works is void. But if the clause "without works" is joined with the word "justifies," the proposition will be true, since faith cannot justify when it is without works, because it is dead, and a mere fiction....Thus faith can no more be separated from works than the sun from its heat. yet faith justifies without works, because works form no reason for our justification." The Reformation attitude is perhaps epitomized in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, XI:11 and XXII, and this allows the *Confession*

recapture.

Much modern evangelicalism has, in the name of faithfulness to the principle of *sola fide*, made anything besides this simple trust to be optional. To stress the necessity of the accompanying graces is construed as an attack on *sola fide* or an attempt to add to the all-sufficient ground by directing faith to a form of self-confidence which rests partially in the merit of human virtues. The only necessities which can stand in relation to justification are thought to be the necessary ground (*solus Christus*) and the necessary instrument (*sola fide*). Because repentance and the other accompanying graces can be construed as good works and cannot function instrumentally, it is believed that the coordinating of these {89} with faith will obscure its uniqueness and cause it to be construed as a work of merit and the Romanist doctrine of congruent merit will re-emerge with God mercifully reckoning faith for righteousness.

This perversion of the *sola fide* (from the “justified by faith alone” to “justified by *alone* [i.e., *lonely*] faith”) has received some degree of impetus from the abstract concentration on an isolated moment of faith. This has tended to obscure the integral connection between faith and the so-called accompanying graces so that *why* they *must* accompany faith and why they are inseparably conjoined to faith is left unclear. An accidental relation, rather than a necessary connection, seems therefore to be the case. The very notion that repentance, love-commitment, and faithful obedience are “*accompanying* graces”—acts and virtues distinguishable from faith—creates this problem, and this nominalistic distinction owes to the narrow concentration upon, and concern with, the abstracted instrumental function of faith which has virtually reduced faith to just that one isolated moment. Abstract thinking (confusing conceptual abstractions with concrete realities) has carried this incidental view of faith to a place where all else accruing to living faith is something which is merely optional.

Lest there be any misunderstanding on this point, I wish to make it absolutely clear that most Reformed teachers desire to

to integrally connect repentance (ch. XV, esp. para. 111) and good works (XVI:II) to saving faith.

follow their Confessional heritage in stressing the necessity of obedient response. A good example is the statement drafted recently by Westminster Theological Seminary on justification by faith. Under heading III, “Faith and justification,” it is stated:

Faith is the sole instrument of justification because it is the unique function of faith to receive and rest upon Christ in whom alone believers are justified. The peculiar relation of faith to grace lies not in the fact that faith is received as a gift, for other graces are also gifts, but that faith receives a gift, the gift of Christ and of justification in union with him.

Faith is never alone in the person justified. True faith cannot be a dead faith, and a living faith works through love. Love is joined with faith as the sinner embraces the Savior who died for him. Yet what cannot be separated must be distinguished. It is not the presence of love or any other accompanying grace that gives faith the power to justify. Faith justifies not because it produces the fruit of love for Christ, but because it receives the fruit of Christ’s love.¹³

And heading IV, on “Works and justification,” states: {90}

The works of love done in faith are pleasing to God and necessary as the fruit of faith. Yet they cannot be included in the reckoning by which God’s verdict of justification is pronounced. Christ’s perfect sacrifice and obedience need no supplementation. Not our flawed works, but only his righteousness, whole and entire, can justify us before God.

The Bible teaches that God requires good works of those who enter into eternal life; at the last judgment complete and searching justice will be rendered according to men’s works. Yet the themes of judgment of works and justification by faith are not seen as contradictory in the New Testament.¹⁴

There are, however, evangelicals—Charles C. Ryrie and Lewis Sperry Chafer are perhaps the paradigm examples¹⁵—who do not

13. *Westminster Statement on Justification* (Chestnut Hill, PA: Westminster Theological Seminary, 1980), 4. (This statement was approved by the Seminary faculty and adopted by the Board of Trustees on May 27, 1980.)

14. *Ibid.*

15. See Ryrie’s *Balancing the Christian Life* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1969), 169–81; Chafer’s *Systematic Theology*, 8 vols. (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948), III, 371–93. See also J. Dwight Pentecost, *Things that Become Sound Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970), 61–72.

share this balance.

Moreover, though somewhat surprising and, from my point of view, far more tragic, even some Reformed leaders seem to be somewhat confused, displaying dislike for the attribution of “*necessary*” to good works and regarding the future judgment of works as having to do only with the degree of rewards for the redeemed rather than involving any question of eternal destiny. This confusion was brought to the surface by the reaction of many ostensibly Reformed thinkers to the “Shepherd Controversy” at Westminster Seminary some years ago. Only two examples can here be given, due to the size constraints of this paper, but these are by no means isolated instances. R.C. Sproul responded to Norman Shepherd’s formulations (“Thirty-Four Theses on Justification in Relation to Faith, Repentance, and Good Works,” submitted by Mr. Shepherd to the Presbytery of Philadelphia of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church on Nov. 18, 1978) by saying:

Thesis #23 illustrates the problem. “... good works ... though not the ground of justification, are nevertheless necessary for salvation from eternal condemnation and therefore for justification.” This formulation is replete with the confusion of formulation I’ve already mentioned. The good works are not the ground of, yet are necessary for, justification. Which justification? If they are necessary are they thereby a condition? If they are necessary as a condition would they have at least congruous merit?

What’s the matter with the traditional view that good works are necessary for sanctification or are necessary as evidence {91} of authentic faith? We acknowledge that our reward in heaven will be distributed *according to* works, not by merit which imposes obligation upon God to reward them, but by a gracious act of God “crowning His own works” (Augustine). The working of Thesis #23 is seriously misleading and I would appeal to Norman to alter it.¹⁶

Confusion is often in the eye of the beholder and it seems to me that Mr. Sproul’s statement is the one which is “replete with confusion of formulation,” for, as stated, his query concerning the *necessity* of works *sounds like* a departure from the Reformed

16. Cited in the “Report to the Board of Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary by the Special Board-Faculty Committee on Justification—Minority Report” (May 13, 1980), 13.

tradition. To move this necessity to the sphere of sanctification only serves to push the problem back one step without removing it, for Heb. 12:14 (cited in W.C.F., XIII:I) tells us that without holiness (sanctification) no man shall see the Lord (i.e., be saved, escape condemnation) and this holiness of life is simply obedience in thought, word, and deed to the covenant law—good works (W.C.F, XVI:I and II; XIX:V–VII)—as the renewing power of the Spirit progressively implicates us into the sphere of the covenant realized in Christ. This being the case, must we not say that holiness (and the obedience which results therefrom) are necessary to vindication unto Kingdom-life (not-yet perspective) at the last judgment, which is a judgment of works?

Moreover, justification fits into an eschatological framework of the scene of the last judgment in the Day of the LORD; it is a seizing beforetime of that verdict, which means that to speak of passing that judgment is to speak of justification. This was Shepherd's point which Sproul could not grasp. Sproul asks, "Which justification?" but Shepherd has been very clear in asserting that there is only one act of justification which can be viewed from several different perspectives, focusing on different aspects (e.g., the "already/not yet" perspective of N.T. eschatology). Shepherd is speaking of the future judgment according to works, but this is still part of the one verdict of justification. Sproul, of course, views the final judgment as merely for rewards and therefore misses its integral connection with justification as recognized by the previously cited *Westminster Statement* (to which, of course, Sproul is not in any way bound, except insofar as it reflects the teaching of Scripture). Accordingly, Sproul must have a difficult time with any necessity that cannot be categorized as either ground or instrument and would therefore have trouble (if consistent) with the "necessity" affirmed in W.C.F., XV:II–III and XVI:II regarding repentance and good works. If he were consistent in this line of thinking, he would have to drive a wedge between the Saviourship {92} and Lordship of Christ, between justification and sanctification, and between faith and good works; such a view makes sanctification optional and purely voluntary, denuding faith of obedience as though it *could* be alone. We are, of course, certain that Sproul did not intend to convey such antinomian implications.

Arthur Kuschke raised similar objections to Shepherd's *Thirty-*

Four Theses in his “Opening Statement by Arthur Kuschke, at the Presbytery’s [Pres. of Philadelphia, O.P.C.] Preliminary Consideration of Mr. Shepherd’s Thirty-Four Theses on Justification, Dec. 16, 1978.” Failing to note that the Scripture exhorts us to abide in Christ and persevere in the faith (which is to continue in the state of justification), Kuschke leaps to the unwarranted conclusion that Shepherd, in stressing the necessity of perseverance in the way of truth and righteousness through covenant obedience (Thesis 21), can only be construed in a causal sense and indeed as intruding upon the *ground* of justification.¹⁷ This is done despite the fact that Shepherd began this thesis by stating. “The exclusive ground of the justification of the believer in the state of justification is the righteousness of Jesus Christ.” This caveat is simply summarily dismissed by Kuschke as contradictory. What are contradictory are the objections raised by Kuschke. He at first says that the ascription of necessity to obedient perseverance intrudes upon the exclusive relationship of *faith* to justification (which is a non-contributory, non-meritorious instrument). He then proceeds to say that if the believer’s obedience is necessary to justification (which, by the way, is *not* what Shepherd said; this is a misstatement of the sense of the thesis), “the righteousness of Christ is not the exclusive *ground* of justification....”¹⁸ Kuschke seems especially confused here. First of all, he cannot conceive of any necessity which is not causal (in the sense of either the instrumental or meritorious cause of justification), and this would seem to imply that perseverance has no necessary relation to our being right with God and escaping condemnation at the last judgment. Furthermore, he seems to confuse instrument and ground. Which does obedient continuance in the way of life intrude upon, the instrumental function of faith or the grounding function of Christ’s righteousness? Or has faith assumed a contributory place in the ground of justification for Kuschke, so that by intruding into the exclusive realm of faith, obedience enters the realm of ground? Moreover, we have here only unsupported assertions; how and why does the necessity of obedience threaten *sola fide/solus Christus* when discussing the continuance in the

17. “Opening Statement,” 4.

18. *Ibid.*

state of justification?

Kuschke simply lapses into the assertion that God's act of {93} justification cannot be annulled and that obedience inevitably (automatically? mechanically?) follows, little realizing that he has thereby virtually dispensed with the Reformed doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. He says, "This thesis implies that if the believer does not obey he will not continue in the state of justification."¹⁹ Does he mean to imply that, "carnal Christians," disobedient and unsanctified believers *would* be justified? Does he wish to annul the warnings, admonitions, and exhortations of the Scriptures (e.g. throughout *Hebrews*) insinuating that God is not really serious about these threats because, by our legislative logical syllogism, we have determined that "once justified, always justified?" It would seem that it is just this sort of autonomous logicism which controls his conclusions from justification, for in his comments on Thesis 22 he seems to imply that believers will be justified at the last judgment even without personal godliness,²⁰ and in dealing with Thesis 23, he reduces the last judgment to merely the determination of degrees of reward for the justified with no bearing on eternal destiny.²¹

What we seem to have in the case of both Sproul and Kuschke (and, again, many others could be easily cited) is not simply a *failure* to understand Shepherd's covenantal perspective, but a recalcitrant *refusal* to even attempt such an understanding, to interpret Shepherd's formulations from *within* his framework.²² This appears to be due to a hide-bound traditionalism, a conviction

19. *Ibid.*

20. *Ibid.*

21. *Ibid.*, 5.

22. Basic to Shepherd's formulations is his insistence on the *covenantal perspective* which focuses upon the things God has revealed as the terms of the covenant, the covenant duties and obligations His covenant people are to observe and practice as their covenant life in covenantal response (*cf. Deut. 29:29*). We cannot (and ought not attempt to) second-guess the secret counsels of God's elective decrees; our concern is not to presume about what only God can know about regeneration, justification, and/or elections, but to believe the covenant word and be concerned about obedient response. From this perspective, to abide in the state of justification is to abide in the sphere of covenant life by obeying Christ's commandments (*John 15:1-16*). See further Shepherd's "The Covenant Context for Evangelism."

that the formulations of the past cannot be improved upon but represent the ultimate and final word for all time. Yet there are problems with the past ways of stating the faith which bring into question the propriety of uncritical repetition.

The problem with the traditional Reformed emphases, as balanced as they are for the most part, is the “logic” of their position. Even recognizing that the problem largely results from the imposition of the legislative logic of would-be autonomous man in judgment over the Scriptural system, this very logic has been allowed to govern evangelicalism precisely because it has not been uprooted by a faith which submits to the Lordship of Christ by bringing every thought captive in obedience. Because the evangelical faith, even as propagated by the traditionally Reformed, does not stress the essential Lordship-confession, autonomous logic is not challenged by the Augustinian “*Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis.*” The traditional Reformed position asserts the following as orthodox statements on justification by faith: {94}

(1) We affirm that God’s justification of the believing sinner is pronounced with eschatological finality in this life...; and we deny that the sinner must await God’s judgment at the last day for his definitive justification. We affirm that...God’s justification of the ungodly is once-for-all and absolutely irreversible...²³

(2) We affirm that faith alone, considered judicially apart from any works that faith produces is the only instrument of justification; and we deny that the good works of the believing sinner may be regarded as the instrument of or the way to justification.²⁴

(3) We affirm that justifying faith in its essence is an embracing of Christ alone for salvation in distinction from the new obedience that it produces; and we deny that justifying faith can be defined properly so that it virtually includes in its essence the new obedience which faith inevitably produces.²⁵

(4) We affirm that God justifies the sinner instantly and with

23. *Westminster Statement*, 14 (‘Affirmations and Denials,’) 1:6 & 7).

24. *Ibid.* (‘Affirmations and Denials,’ II:1

25. *Ibid.*, 15 (‘Affirmations and Denials,’ 11:3

irreversible finality on the event of faith....²⁶

Despite many other statements the Reformed also make to qualify, to give balance, and to do full justice to *tota Scriptura*,²⁷ legislative logic results in concluding that, if the instant faith is exercised one is definitively justified with irreversible finality, saving faith is a punctiliar moment—a one-time act rather than a continuous life-process—and the last judgment is irrelevant to justification, perseverance is optional (once saved, always saved), and obedience has no necessary relation to justification. Nothing in this conception of faith results in good works and obedient love; justification is a purely forensic declaration which does not renew and transform the sinner into a faithful covenant-keeper. There seems to be no grounds for the other assertions made by the Reformed; they seem to be autonomous reasoning as unjustified assertions, lacking any support and appearing as inconsistencies remaining from a failure to work out the implications of the pure *sola gratis/sola fide*.

In order to support the inevitability of good works proceeding out from, as the fruit of, faith, some Reformed lapse into a nature/grace schema. In this schema, the inevitability of the accompanying graces and of perseverance in faith depend on a mechanical-automatic working of the Spirit. In this view, the Spirit's work cannot be anything {95} but impersonalistic. It seems to conceive of a supernatural necessitarianism set over against a natural libertarianism and of the reduction of salvation to a Divine monologue. This mechanistic monergism only fans the flames of Arminian opposition, in that it requires the cooperation of human free-will and thereby only hardens the Arminian's conception of the *sola fide* as necessitating a voluntary (hence, optional) surrender and commitment to the Lordship of Christ. Neither this mechanistic model of the external violation of human personhood—which supernaturally (artificially) conjoins the punctiliar decision of passive justifying faith with the other graces—nor the synergism rampant in modern evangelicalism is truly Reformed. Reformed thought rejects the nature/grace

26. *Ibid.* ("Affirmations and Denials," II:7).

27. See the other "Affirmations and Denials" in *ibid.* for the balanced treatment characteristic of Reformed thought.

dichotomy; nature and supernature are pagan conceptions designed to safeguard the autonomy of man.²⁸ Moreover, what Van Til has said about synergism unmasks its common assumption with mechanistic monergism, which turn out to be but the two sides of the same error.

Synergism takes for granted that there can be no truly personal relation between God and man unless the absoluteness of God be denied in proportion that the freedom of man is maintained. Synergism assumes that an act of man cannot be truly personal unless such an act be impersonal. By that we mean that according to synergism, a personal act of man cannot at the same time but in a different sense, be a personal act of God. Synergism assumes that *either* man *or* God acts personally at a certain time, and at a certain place, but they cannot act personally simultaneously at the same point of contact.²⁹

The choice for the mechanistic monergists is then between God, conceived as acting externally on man in a depersonalized way, or man exercising wholly human capacities (if they are to be in any sense human and personal) of choice and virtue. Therefore, the mechanistic monergists cannot integrate faith and the accompanying graces as unified covenantal response (analogical activity) and modern evangelicalism chooses between an antinomian easy-believism or a “let go and let God” mystical passivity in its conception of spiritual sanctification. Common to all these options is the problem—unsupported assertions to the contrary—of conceiving of an active faith once it has been essentially defined as wholly passive, of relating works and faith once these have been set in tension. If we wish to press the claims of Christ in an anti-authoritarian age, we must reformulate faith in a way which can {96} do justice to the biblical conception of the

28. See e.g. R.J. Rushdoony, *The Mythology of Science* (Nutley, N.J.: Craig Press, 1967), 96–98 (Appendix 1. The Myth of Nature). As K.J. Popma writes in his ‘The Patristic Evaluation of Culture’ (in K.A. Bril, H. Hart, and J. Klapwijk, eds., *The Idea of a Christian Philosophy: Essays in Honour of D.H. Th. Vollenhoven* [Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1973]), 103. ‘The idea of the supernatural does not come from the Bible, but from paganism....’ In keeping with its nature/grace conception, the mechanistic monergists make faith and the other graces *donna superaddita*, placing the Divine in tension with the human.

29. *The Metaphysics of Apologetics*, 66, cited in Rushdoony, *By What Standard?* (Birmingham, AL: Cornerstone Publishers, 1974), 36f.

obedient faith of covenantal response.

Reconstruction

We live in an age of humanism, of man-centered thinking. Our age is one in which many people regard salvation as “fire insurance.” People are concerned with what God can do for them, with what is in it for them. Human needs (and desires) are of prime importance, and being saved is viewed as an end in itself. Since salvation is proclaimed as a free gift, this means “no strings attached”—no conditions, no commitments. We therefore face rampant antinomianism—cheap grace and easy-believism. In this situation, “not of works” is not a condemnation of the humanistic arrogance and idolatrous self-trust of those who would presumptuously attempt to obligate God as indebted to man, reducing Him to the role of servant to the will of sovereign man. Rather it has come to mean that we do not need to do anything; we can sit back worry-free, take it easy and let God do it for us; we can make our decision, pocket our “freebie” salvation and forget about it until needed, since “once saved, always saved.” Salvation is thereby conceived as simply an insurance policy and we can hold God accountable to honor it unconditionally—despite what we do—since it is “paid up” by Christ’s payment for us. In such a narcissistic framework, *sola gratia/sola fide* has come to lead to presumption and complacency, and the only relation to *solī Deo gloria* this view of salvation as an end in itself can have is that such Divine magnanimity shows what a “good sport” God really is in making no demands upon man.

Obviously, this is quite a different situation than that faced by the Reformers, who pre-eminently developed their doctrinal formulations in their polemics against Roman Catholicism. They confronted penance and indulgences, congruent merit, a view of justification as a transforming process brought about by an infusion of medicinal grace; they confronted a legalistic system that grounded the basis of justification in the character of man. Certainly, they had to field the objections Rome hurled at them about the alleged antinomian tendency of their *sola fide*, and therefore we find them talking of a living faith which works through love, but they primarily were fighting legalism, not

antinomianism.

Unless we are to be idolaters, we cannot absolutize *any* tradition. We learn from tradition; we stand on the shoulders of godly men who preceded us, for Christ has given His church the gift of teachers {97} throughout her history and this deposit is a heritage to the church universal throughout the ages which is not to be despised or neglected. Nonetheless, tradition is always subordinate to the authority of Scripture, ever subject to the judgment of the Word, if *sola Scriptura* is to be anything more than merely a polemically charged slogan which allows the Word to be bound in service to simply another set of infallible magisterial traditions.

If we are to be biblical in our thinking, we must recognize that theology is a human activity, one which attempts to analogically reinterpret the Divine interpretation given in the Word in order to apply it in diverse situational contexts. Certainly, in recognizing the humanity of our theologizing we want to be cognizant of the fallibility of our interpretation because of the noetic effects of sin, but we must go still further. We are finite; our knowledge is always partial, limited, and therefore *tentative* and *relative*. Our interpretation is perspectively bound and situationally relative. This creaturely limitation cannot be transcended; indeed, the desire to transcend it is the desire to be as God. We see in a glass darkly, knowing and prophesying in part. Our theologizing is but childish stammerings, Luther's theology of the Cross as opposed to a theology of glory.

One of the creaturely limitations which must be faced is that man is a temporal being. Consequently, his theologizing is never the final word, the absolute, ultimate, eternal statement conceived of like a transcendent Platonic Form. Theology is historically relative and God's truth needs to be restated in each age as relevant to the problem-historical situation provided by the peculiar errors, heresies, and manifestations of unbelief which the church confronts and must challenge with prophetic witness to the truth. Different emphases serve different purposes, and no one statement of the faith can say it all for all time.

By understanding the relativity of the Reformers' specific formulations *vis-a-vis* their immediate application to the problems and questions of the time, we can avoid the abstractionism so prevalent in the subsequent Protestant scholasticism which

sought for a theology of glory, an eternal and absolutist system, by rigidifying the Reformers' expressions into dogma. Theology is often theoretical and academic. In proper context, there is nothing wrong with a scientific, critical concern when an embryonic confession of faith must be analyzed for purposes of defense and explanation—for answers to the questions of “how?” and “why?” For example, the Trinity is a theoretical-conceptual model which attempts to synthesize into a consistent explanation all the relevant Scriptural data in answer to the problem (evoked by the Arian challenge) as to *how* the church could confess monotheism, yet worship Christ and the Spirit equally with the Father as God. The church had been doing this all along (it was an unproblematic confessional and doxological response to the economy of salvation—e.g., 1 Pet. 1:2), but the Trinity explanation developed and was not in mature form until the fourth century.

Because theology must engage in critical reflection, it must deal with abstractions. There is nothing wrong with conceptual abstractions in the theoretical context; they are the proper field of investigation for intensive analysis. If one wishes to focus narrowly and carefully on one particular aspect as the area of immediate concern, one must isolate all that is not immediately relevant to the specific area one concentrates upon relative to the question one is asking in that inquiry. This is clearly what the Reformers were doing in zeroing in on the issues raised by the Roman Catholic system of indulgences, penance, congruent merit, etc. The problem only comes (and it is a common pitfall in the history of ideas) when abstractions are reified, confused for concrete things. Such confusion allowed these hypothetized concepts to be divorced from their specific problem and allowed the literal-minded scholastics to treat what were often images, metaphors, and analogies as actual states of affairs. (This was especially true of Luther, but Calvin as well.)

Thus, the imputation of an “alien” righteousness (*extrinsecam, alienam, extra nos*) can only be understood as a concept intended to challenge the Romanist insistence on an infused or inherent righteousness. Out of this context, justification by imputation would be a legal fiction. Luther and Calvin merely wished to oppose transformational righteousness *in* man as the ground of man being *constituted* righteous; they did not intend to deny the

reality of the rightening, constitutive act of God as though God were regarding as righteous those who in fact were not righteous (treating the unrighteous *as if* righteous). For them, union with Christ was basic and this union was real, *existential* union, not a reckoning *as though* in Christ. This limits how far we can carry the idea of the *alien* nature of righteousness, for it is truly made our own by the reality of being in Christ and identified with Him. There is no bare declaration, nor is imputation merely some bizarre bookkeeping procedure in the heavenly debit/credit ledgers; we are constituted righteous by being intimately related to Christ, which rightly relates us to God by making ours the same relationship Christ covenantally has with God. Rather than reading the Reformers' language in a vacuum, we must always {99} strive to discern its intent relative to concrete debates, realizing that their modes of expression have liabilities which, if not recognized, can be pitfalls to those who merely repeat the specific form of proclamation.

We do not honor the Reformers by allowing categories which effectively served them in their battles to become bonds and fetters upon the Word for us, as though we may never improve upon them, or even dispense with them, in order that we may utilize a better set of concepts and categories more suited to our age and its problems. Let us, therefore, go behind the Reformers' applications of Scripture in their situation and look afresh at Paul in order to see if the Pauline concept of saving faith will provide us with the Spiritual weapons we need to do battle with the prevalent antinomian heresy of our day.

Is the Pauline conception of faith the opposite of *doing*? Does it stand in antithesis to all works and human activity? This formulation, the heart of the traditional Protestant understanding of the Pauline gospel (Romans 3:21–4:25, Galatians 2:16–3:13, and Ephesians 2:80, would seem to support this faith/works contrast. Yet Paul can speak of faith as working through love (Gal. 5:6) and the obedience of faith (Rom. 1:5; 16:26). Indeed, in most instances which seem to describe or define saving faith, Paul does not stress passivity, a mere reliance upon and resting in the merits of Christ's work as the sole basis of justification. Faith is defined as calling upon the Name of the Lord, which is confessing that Jesus is Lord

(Rom. 10:9–13).³⁰ Faith is characterized by obedient response (Rom. 1:5; 16:26); it is *submitting* to the righteousness of God (Rom. 10:3). Paul further describes faith baptismally in Romans 6. Here we see that belonging to Christ means being united to Him, being incorporated into Him, participating with Him in His death and resurrection. Reckoning ourselves this way involves (not simply results in) counting ourselves dead to sin and alive to God. Having *obeyed* the gospel, we have surrendered as slaves to righteousness, walking in the newness of life which is obedience. In the trial framework of Romans 3, faith is a siding with the Lord in His claims upon and against the world. Consequently, unbelief and disobedience are equated in God’s assessment of Israel’s covenant history (Rom. 3; Rom. 9–11). Where faith seems passive and most opposed to action is in Romans 4, where Paul is not psychologically analyzing faith but dealing with why Jews should recognize the Christ-event as the revelation of the righteousness of God—the faithful fulfillment of the covenantal promise of God’s righteous reign in power and glory which makes creation right and vindicates His servant-people—despite Israel’s {100} rejection of Jesus as Messiah. The accent is upon the fact that the fulfillment of the promise is based in the resurrection/new creation of Christ (the proleptic nature of Abraham’s faith as anticipating God’s act in Christ). Paul also accents the hope against hope in the promise-word for life from the dead (a theme taken up again in chapters

30. Again, let it be emphasized that the gospel proclaims the Lordship of Christ and faith is the *amen* to this. One confesses Jesus as Lord, believing that God raised Him from the dead, because (as Paul explicated the Resurrection in Rom. 1:4), the Resurrection demonstrates in power God’s appointment of Jesus to the exalted status of Lordship as the Davidic Messiah of Psalm 2 to Whom the nations will render obedience (“Kiss the Son”). The Resurrection vindicates Jesus as the One God has made Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36), the One Who is highly exalted, to Whom every knee shall bow and every tongue confess (Phil. 2:9–11), the One to Whom all is subjected (Acts 2:25; I Cor. 15:24–25; Eph. 1:20–23). The Lordship-confession in the context of Romans 10:6–9 becomes the new *Shema*. confession—the focal point of covenant faith and covenantal call to faithfulness (cf. Deut 6:4)—and is meant to invoke the same response of total and exclusive commitment in love-allegiance to the covenant Lord. The very gospel of the righteousness of God stresses God’s action in Christ in establishing His righteous rule and asserting His prerogatives as Lord by destroying those powers which oppress and enslave His people and putting down opposition and enmity by a display of His power; *it* is the gospel of eschatological victory as the Kingdom is triumphantly established.

9–11). The Jews are to believe the gospel despite the “evidence” of Israel’s unbelief even as Abraham believed in the manifold seed promise despite the “evidence” of his and Sarah’s barrenness.

The presumed contrast of faith and works in Paul is based upon a serious misunderstanding of the error Paul opposed. The term “*works of the law*” (and its abbreviated forms of “works” or “law”) were the Jews’ boast (cf. Rom. 4:2; 3:27). Theirs was a legalistic boast before God, an offering of works-righteousness designed to indebt and obligate God, to *merit* justification.

Indeed, Paul suggests the idea of a boast *before God* by “works of the law” in Romans 4:2 to shock and horrify the Jews, for he wants them to see the implications of their insistence on continuing in the way of “works of the law.” He fully expects them to draw back in revulsion from a position which would repudiate covenant grace. Why else would he make the point in his argument that the boast could not be a boast to God unless he thought that this is a point on which he and the unbelieving Jews, the advocates of “works,” can agree, for otherwise they would simply dismiss his argument? Rather, he has made a case for the abrogation of the Mosaic covenant, due to Israel’s history of unfaithfulness, as a basis for a claim upon the promise, and he construes the situation now as God doing something from *outside* (or apart from) a basis in Moses. Therefore, the issue (as it was for Abraham) is *covenant-entry* (the new covenant, the sphere where righteousness is revealed to be “in Christ”) as opposed to *covenant-continuity* (remaining in the sphere of *torah*).

The Jews’ *boast* of “works” is a fundamentally legitimate boast *in God* (Rom. 2:17), confidence in covenant status and privilege, in knowing the true God and possessing the oracles of God out of which they have been instructed. The boast is a boast before the nations of special privilege, election. This is not legalism (justification by works or merit), nor is it necessarily arrogance, for in the Mosaic economy there was a particularism, an exclusion of the nations and a separatism that emphasized Israel’s special identify as a peculiar people who alone had been elected by God as *His* heritage. Paul can speak of a proper *boast* of the Christians in God as well (cf. Rom. 5:2). {101}

What Paul faults about the Jews’ boast is that it is merely a *hearing* of the law rather than an obedient *doing* of it (Rom. 2:13).

A boast in merely possessing the oracles, in being instructed out of them and having a knowledge of God and His law is not sufficient; covenant-keeping obedience, response to the law out of a circumcised heart is required. Note well, therefore, that Paul sees the problem with “works of the law” as something quite different than we usually take it to be. These “works” are not contrasted to faith because they are a *doing*; the problem with them is that they are a mere *hearing* and the way of *faith* is taken to be the day of *doing* (Rom. 3:31; 8:4). The “works of the law” are *identity-markers*, tokens of covenantal status, external badges which mark off the bearer as belonging to the covenant people; their function is sociological in nature, to signify membership in the community of *hearers*. Circumcision and special diet were pre-eminent among such tokens of covenant identity and boundary for the torah-people, setting them apart from the nations and thereby denoting the Mosaic particularism. Paul therefore contrasts the circumcision sign which signifies the Jewish advantage (cf. Rom. 3:1–2) with the circumcised heart that denoted covenant obedience, the internality of taking the law to heart (Rom. 2:25–29). That *doers* of the law will be justified in the eschatological judgment according to *works* was part of Paul’s gospel proclamation (Rom. 2), and this is not some merely hypothetical scenario designed to accent the impossibility of justification by works.³¹

Throughout Romans Paul is not battling legalism; the issue is universalism versus particularism. Is the fulfillment of the promise for the Jews only or is it for all nations and peoples? This is made clear in the very contexts of Jewish boasting (3:27–30;

31. This statement only sounds radical because we are so used to thinking of the law as a covenant of works and justification by the law as being based upon merit. That sort of thinking, which is at the heart of the law/gospel antithesis, is a total misinterpretation of the law, for the law is integrally rooted in covenant grace. It is a sheer abstraction, therefore, to say that the law demands perfection (and therefore cannot justify, since no one keeps it perfectly), for the law makes provision for sin (which is why Paul could be blameless before the law—*Phil.* 3:6). What the law demanded was submission to God’s Lordship, rendering obedience to Him out of covenant fidelity; it only cursed as transgression of the covenant those “high-handed,” presumptuous, willful sins which manifested contempt for the covenant and rebellion against God’s Lordship. The Mosaic law as covenant was, of course, grounded in Christ (cf. *Rom.* 3:25) and therefore derived its efficacy from the Christ-event as the basis upon which God could forbearingly pass over the failings of the faithful and godly Israelites.

4:12, 16–17). Gentile inclusion is to be apart from the “works of the law”—apart from Gentiles having to become Jews by adopting the marks of Jewishness. There is simply nothing here about good works and attempts to obey the eternal moral law (a theological category denoting the expression of the holy character of God as normative for image-behavior). *Law* in these contexts means *Mosaic law—torah*—and Paul’s rejection of it is not based upon an antithesis posited between a principle of doing and a principle of passivity in receiving and believing. Paul’s opposition to Mosaic law is *redemptive-historical* in nature. The Jews can *no longer* have confidence in their identification with the Mosaic covenant and the people of that covenant. Their special status has been set aside {102} because God’s eschatological judgment, the ultimatum stage of a covenant lawsuit God has been prosecuting through the prophets, lays bare the over-all pattern of the covenant history of the nation as a whole (obviously not each and every individual Jew) removes all grounds of boasting in such identification with an unfaithful and disobedient people (chapters 2–3). The righteousness of God is, therefore, His faithful action despite the unfaithfulness of the people. It comes from outside the covenant of circumcision (the line of which developed redemptive-historically into the Mosaic covenant) which, as broken, is annulled and can make no demand upon the righteousness (faithfulness) of God but has rather led to covenant wrath in the lawsuit trial. It comes instead from the broader line of Abrahamic promise (as father of many nations), extending to Jews and Gentiles.

So too in Galatians, Paul rejects “works of the law” because they constitute a particularistic barrier to gospel universalism. In the time of the Mosaic economy, they were intended to do this; the rabbis spoke of the “fence” of the law, stressing the identity and boundary-function of the law in distinguishing Israel from the nations. To be *under the law* was to be under its jurisdiction and authority, enclosed in its sphere of reign as a tutor, governor, or *paidagogos*. The law shut out bad influences, kept Israel under its supervision; it was a “babysitter” for the covenant children. This function was only until the redemptive-historical time of faith (the coming of Christ in the fullness of time) when the promise would be fulfilled. Since the promise is of universal blessing, Mosaic particularism could only be a hindrance; the wall of separation (cf.

Eph. 2:14) not only had outlived its usefulness but, if the Judaizers insisted upon re-erecting what God had torn down, they were setting up Mosaic law in opposition to the work of God in Christ in fulfilling the Abrahamic promise to all nations. Indeed, their allegiance to the *torah* was an allegiance rivaling the Lordship of Christ—as though a threat to usurp His reign. Jewishness had come to mean more to them than Christ.

We simply do not have in Paul the opposition of works to faith which traditionalism has stressed. Legalism is certainly to be opposed, but as an affront to the Lordship of Christ, an attempt to usurp that Lordship through a declaration of autonomy, robbing God of His glory and seeking to reduce Him to the role of man's servant, obliged to reward man. Lordship-confession, though emphasizing obedient submission, stands fundamentally opposed to self-exaltation; it is the obedient response of a humble servant who renders to His Master (cf. Luke 17:10). Lordship faith can therefore {103} emphasize obedient working (cf. Heb. 11) without danger of legalism.

Indeed, legalism has nothing to do with obedience; legalism is fundamentally disobedient to the covenant. The covenant concept (governing the Mosaic law as well as the new covenant) eschews all idea of human merit. This is why the idea of a covenant of works is so pernicious and has led to much of the confusion about a supposed law/grace contrast. There is no works-principle in God's covenants with man. The covenant stresses the priority of God's grace, of His electing lovingkindness in initiating the bond of relationship. God sovereignly and freely sets His love, bestows His favor, upon a person or people. God acts for His covenant party, blesses him, makes promises to him, then He calls for response. *Because* of what God has done, the recipient is to love God, be thankful, cleave to Him, swear exclusive allegiance to Him and render obedience to Him as covenant Lord. All covenants have promise and duty and set forth both blessing and cursing in terms of the faithfulness or unfaithfulness to one's covenantal obligations.

The law was not a works principle. It was covenantal wisdom and instruction for life to the covenant son, who was to image the glory of His Father and bear His likeness by being holy as God is holy. There was no principle of merit involved. The covenant son hoped in God's faithfulness, resting on His grace, love and mercy

and finding confidence in His promise. The law enjoined faith and repentance. Obedience involved loving God pre-eminently and seeking His glory in grateful response to His blessing and trust in His lovingkindness. The law offered forgiveness by atoning sacrifice to those who repented of sin and hoped in the mercy of God. Israel did not understand her works to be the basis of her election, but saw gracious election by the good pleasure of God as the basis for her covenant status and did not relate works to covenant-entry as though to earn Divine favor. Works were *response*, doing what the covenant required. It was the covenant which constituted her righteousness, which grounded her standing before God, but obedience was the means of abiding in the sphere of the covenant as the sphere of her righteousness and life.

Obedience was perseverance in covenant life. The son cannot earn his status as son and does nothing to *merit* it, but he must act like a son, walk worthy of his status by bringing honor to the Name he bears as son, by manifesting the likeness of his Father. A son must render obedience to his Father and an incorrigibly disobedient son can be cut off and disinherited.

We must conclude, therefore, that obedience is of the *essence* of {104} saving faith. As G. C. Berkouwer has well stated. "Obedience is essential to faith for it illustrates the truth that faith is not autonomous and self-sufficient—that it capitulates in total surrender."³² Faith is "bringing every thought captive to the obedience of Christ' (2 Cor. 10:5) and, as such, demolishes every pretension which sets itself up against the knowledge of God. Its character is not determined by an opposition to works but by the theocentricity of the principle of *soli Deo gloria*, for it is zealously and jealously concerned that in all things Christ would have pre-eminence. The Lord will not share His glory with another.

How may we reconstruct the correlation of faith and justification? First, bearing in mind that justification must be understood as having to do with the eschatological judgment activity of God in the Day of the LORD. This is not simply a courtroom scene for rendering verdicts of acquittal or condemnation. God's coming in judgment, in its Old Testament framework of meaning, involves

32. *Faith and Justification (Studies in Dogmatics)*, trans. Lewis B. Smedes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), 195.

the actual defeat and destruction of His enemies, of those powers which oppose His rule or are hostile to Him. Since God acts on His people's behalf, His judgment is a delivering and liberating of His people from the forces of oppression and bondage; it is the glorifying and exalting of His people, a demonstratively powerful vindication of them as the people with Whom He sides. His judgment activity rights creation, restores its proper order in relation to Him, bestowing peace and rest. His coming in judgment is the outpouring of the Spirit, both to bring fiery ordeal to consume the adversary and to renew, transform, and recreate in glory, establishing the fullness of God's covenant presence with His people. God's judgment is righteous because it faithfully fulfills the covenant which is to bring the Kingdom, to create theocratic order. Another name for this is the "revelation of the righteousness of God." Justification is simply the state which results from this righteous activity of God coming in eschatological judgment to act in His people's behalf. It has primary reference to what God has done in Christ, for the Christ-event is the revelation of the righteousness of God, the eschatological saving activity of God displayed in Spirit-power. Justification is primarily the vindication of Christ by the Resurrection and the declaration that He is the Son in power (Rom. 1:4). Justification is the establishment of Christ as reigning Lord. Our justification is participation in this justification of Christ by our incorporation into Him as those Spiritually united to Christ. We are justified when we are transferred into the sphere of Christ's Lordship which is the sphere of realized new creation, the sphere of the Spirit. {105}

Second, then, is to dispense with the conceptual model of application-receipt and an *ordo salutis*. The proper conception is existential union with Christ. There is simply no place for a series of successive moments in the concept of unity; all the soteric blessings of God's righteous activity are interconnected, mutually involved, inseparable and simultaneous. For example, in light of what was said above about the Divine judgment and on the basis of unbiased exegesis, what John Murray intended by the concept of "*definitive sanctification*"³³ must be included in justification. Our

33. "Definitive Sanctification," *Collected Works of John Murray*, vol. 2. *Select Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Iain Murray (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth,

conceptual distinctions threaten to sever what is actually a unified whole, to divide Christ and God's *act* of raising Him from the dead to be Lord.³⁴

Instead of attempting to view salvation as composed of discrete moments, as being made of component parts, we should perhaps conceive of different perspectives upon the whole. Thus, to speak of our justification is not to identify one of several things that happen to us or are bestowed upon us in Christ; rather we are speaking about union with Christ itself in its wholeness and unity. To effect our union with Christ is to justify us. Justification specifically views the definitive act of our being rightly related to God because of our relation to Christ as the One Whom God has accepted, approved, vindicated, adopted, exalted and glorified, the One upon Whom God has set His love and bestowed His favor. Justification stresses the work of God as definitive, fully accomplished and realized; union with Christ can also be viewed from the perspective of the on-going process of renewal effected by the Spirit's work to conform the justified to the image of Christ, a work we commonly call sanctification.

My objection to the application-receipt model is that it again tends to the reification of abstractions. Obviously, the idea of union lends itself more to the conception of Christ receiving us, or our being received into Christ, than it does to our receiving something which is applied to us. Application lends itself to the conception of righteousness as a thing bestowed upon us (whether by imputation or impartation. both sides agreed on righteousness as a reified quality, differing only as to how it was

1977), 277–84. Murray's comments on Romans 8:1–4, in his *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968), 274ff., are most insightful in showing that the justification (set over against condemnation as its antithesis in 8:1) spoken of involves liberation from the bonds of sin's power and dominion and unto the reign of life as freedom in the Spirit. This concept, however, goes beyond the traditional Protestant-dogmatic conception of justification as a bare declaration to deal with forensic guilt and penalty. This broader conception of justification, as answering to the reign of sin as enslaving power, is what Murray has called 'definitive sanctification. in his exposition of Romans 6. The subsuming of this breaking of the power of sin under justification clears up the otherwise odd usage of *dikaioo/dikaioōsunē* language in Romans 6:7 and 16ff.

34. Richard B. Gaffin Jr., *The Centrality of the Resurrection: A Study in Pauline Soteriology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1978), 136–142.

bestowed). Righteousness is rather a relational term descriptive of the relation of covenant parties. It simply denotes right relationship, doing what is expected and required according to the terms of the covenant bond. Imputing righteousness therefore is not *putting* or *placing* righteousness as some sort of essence on deposit in an account to which faith is a deed of entitlement. It is God's regarding one as right with Him, as rightly related to Him in the covenant. It is Christ Who embodies and personifies the antitypical bond between God and Man. So, the quest {106} for the instrumental cause is called into question, since it seeks to identify something which can act as a channel of receipt and application. The real question must be. "What relates us to Christ; what sort of relationship to Him must we have?" Obviously, this is a faith-relationship, but it is specifically one which relates us to Him as servant-subject to Lord, the fullness of concrete faith which includes radical repentance, faithfulness, obedience, commitment, etc. It is covenant faith as obedient response—total response of the whole man to the all-consuming, comprehensive demand of the covenant.

How best can we proclaim this gospel of Lordship? Can we find a model which will underscore the integral unity of salvation and discipleship? I think a key has been provided by John Frame. Frame seeks to develop a theology of Lordship and distinguishes three aspects of or perspectives on the idea of Lordship. authority, control, and presence.³⁵ We may think of presence as what is usually considered as the bestowal of salvation. God is with His people in order to be for them and act on their behalf, saving, defending, blessing, and keeping them. This presence includes both the bestowal of the Spirit and existential union with Christ effected by the Spirit through which they enjoy all that is in Christ as the sphere of our salvation and life. Authority stresses what we narrowly would think of as the Lordship of Christ as the One Who exercises dominion and jurisdiction over His people, as the One Who rules and is to be obeyed. This aspect lays stress upon

35. *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (unpublished lecture notes. Westminster Theological Seminary, 1980), 8f. Mr. Frame has recently published an expanded version of this work by the same title (Philipsburg, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1987). Mr. Frame is not responsible for my applications of his model.

the requirements of allegiance, submission, and commitment as covenant response. Control emphasizes the power of God in renewing/recreating to transform us so as to effect our obedience and bring us under the sway of His Lordship.

These are obviously so interconnected, interdependent, and mutually involved as to underscore their integral unity as life under the Lord. It is the *presence* of the Spirit (the same presence by which we are savingly related to Christ in existential union), Who exercises *control*, Who transforms us by realizing in us what has been realized in Christ. This transformation brings us in practice evermore into submission to the *authority* of the Lord, causing us to be more faithful and obedient in our response as we more fully recognize the demands and claims of Christ's Lordship, as we daily live *coram Deo*. That control is itself a soteric blessing of releasing us more and more from the hold of sin that we might experience peace and joy.

Salvation is therefore a relation to the Lord Who is our righteousness and sanctification (I Cor. 1:30). It is life under His Lordship. All three aspects must be held together. The sphere of {107} authority and control is the same sphere as the sphere of soteric presence; we are under the *saving* Lordship of Christ which is the reign of life. Christ makes Himself present as Lord to save His people and faith is response to the presence of the covenant Lord Who comes to us in power and authority in Word and Sacraments to make covenant whereby we are rightly related to Him as Lord. We must confess Christ as Lord in order to come under His Lordship which is the right relation to Him that is our justification before God.

Conclusion

From all of this, we may conclude that much of modern evangelicalism has thoroughly distorted the gospel. Justification by faith proclaims Christ's Lordship and our submission to it. Faith therefore is in its essence *obedient*, covenantal response which assumes the right relationship to that Lordship—the bowed knee. Faith does not stand in opposition to good works of obedient service rendered to the Lord; it stands opposed to anything that exalts itself against the Lord. It stands in antithesis to the autonomy

of man, to humanism as the creed of the city of man. Faith is not simply conjoined with accompanying graces; it integrally involves repentance, exclusive love-commitment, and faithfulness. This is the faith of dominion theology which asserts the claims of King Jesus, seeking His glory and challenging all idols. As James made clear, the faith which justifies and saves is a working faith of obedient response which acts upon the command-word of God.

THE COVENANT AND THE CHARACTER OF A NATION

J. A. Wormser

Translated by Gilbert Zekveld

Editor's Note: The following was written sometime between 1850–1860 by J. A. Wormser, bailiff in Amsterdam, Holland from 1842 until he died in 1862. He was a close friend of the great Dutch historian, statesman and publicist Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer (1801–76), the founder of the Anti-Revolutionary Party. A compiler of Wormser's essays said that he was "one of those men who with all their strength and talents labored in order to call his church and his people back to the faith of the fathers during the Reformation." The essay presented here, originally titled "Concerning Infant Baptism," is a recent original translation from the Dutch. It was written at a time, notes translator Zekveld, when virtually the entire population of The Netherlands, except Jews and Anabaptists, were baptized as infants. The author expresses concern over why so few recognized how the covenant promises of God for new life and community, which are sealed in baptism, were designed to have a liberating, unifying and transforming effect on church and society.

Christianity and the Nation

Originally the nation was not Christian, and as such, Christianity {114} was not part of its history. Since that time, Christianity has become part of its history and Christianity has become national. But another foreign power at enmity with the gospel and Christianity, the power of liberalism, has touched and wounded

Christianity...but has not conquered it. We do not deny that the revolution has become part of our history, but we maintain that the nation which at one time changed from a non-Christian to a Christian nation is not ready to change its Christian character for an atheistic character.

Skeletons

Skeletons are not useless. Even a skeleton has power to resist; it has some independence. A skeleton is not superfluous but has evidence that it belongs to a body, or used to belong to one.

The skeletons of church, the Day of Rest, and infant baptism, if indeed these institutions have become skeletons, do show us how much we have wasted, and what is the situation we shall meet when we do not think of restoration.

That I present the church and its confession, the sabbath and also infant baptism to you as a skeleton I blame on those who take pleasure to see these institutions as a skeleton.

I am not afraid to draw this picture, and I will take it for granted that all these institutions may be skeletons. And even so, they show me that church and sabbath and infant baptism do not only belong to the flesh, but are part of the more solid backbone and so belong to the certainty (steadfastness) of Christianity. And I know that no one shall think little of the system which gives him shape, even though it is only a skeleton.

Searching Theology and Narrow-mindedness

I think it praiseworthy that the scientist works independently, but at the present time it is very much to be regretted that he does not find this independence as a student of Christ. I would almost say, in order to give expression to what I mean, that science in its modern liberal direction is not baptized. That is to say that modern liberalism did not die with Christ, neither is it raised with Christ... hence its collision with the baptized church that lives and receives divine wisdom, because the living church died with Christ also concerning her own wisdom.

Furthermore, without question, there are within the reformed churches people of a sickly and narrow-minded persuasion, which

{115} do not freely experience the liberating and redeeming power of the death and resurrection of Christ. It is with this persuasion that the sickly side of theological science is mainly of one mind, although they claim not to agree.

The church as a whole must and does live and is fed from a common good, but both the narrow-minded and modern theological science seek their sustenance often in that which each individual discovers rationally. Modern theology overlooks the truth, and concerns itself primarily with searching; [on the other hand,] many members of the church seem to think they possess unique information not given to other believers. Both are wrong—[truth is] not that which is discovered after eighteen centuries, but that which has been the common good of God's people during eighteen centuries. Truth is not knowledge which is obtainable by a few, but that which may be obtained by all. It is not to be caught up in the third heaven as Paul was, but God's grace in Christ, in which the whole church participates. It is that by which everyone (the learned and the unlearned) must be saved. Believers are not saved by that which is distinct, but by that which they have in common.

Unity and Catholicity of Divided Church Saved in Baptism

When we do appreciate this at all, we see that it witnesses against all one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness. For baptism requires that the one baptized shall improve upon his baptism until it appears in its full strength. It also requires that we see the baptism of others as an institution that asks for our help, that others too may come to the full recognition of the truth. There are circumstances in which, in order to keep the truth and to have no communion with the sins of others, division and removal become necessary. But in doing so, we must be very careful and not hurt any more than is necessary.

In as much as we deny anything good in others, we hurt ourselves and rob ourselves of any contact to influence others and help others. This is especially true with a view to acknowledging each other's baptism; when we have an objective view of baptism, we have a right and an obligation to admonish others to walk as

baptized people.

Being exclusivistic and being conscientious are not the same. The first always draws back, is passive. With its limited appreciation of God's grace, it has no means to fight unrighteousness. The other, quite to the contrary, leans upon God's promises, is active, spreads itself, appreciates what is good in others and is victorious in its battle {116} against the rule of misconception and unrighteousness.

Narrow-mindedness is always without fruit, and has always been an overflowing fountain of misconception and wrong-doing in the church. Therefore, it is important to remember that baptism in all of Christendom is a common foundation of a consecrated life, and it gives us the right and calls us to exhort concerning doctrine and walk, wherever needed. And as we appreciate our own baptism, we shall be earnest and serious in admonishing those that are baptized with us but err or are indifferent. As it is at present, the one does indeed acknowledge the baptism of the other, but without taking it seriously. This should be much different when we would realize that as Christians we have claims and duties toward each other, the claims and duties of those who are baptized into the name and service of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

“Baptized Heathens”

This is a very unhappy expression but is said of the majority of the nation, because of its falling away in doctrine and conversation, and almost nobody is troubled by it; it saddens but a few. We have become used to it, and because of our misconception concerning baptism, we restrict Christianity to those that are knowingly converted unto the Lord. We have become used to the idea that someone's Christianity begins with his conversion. But what was he during the time between his [infant] baptism and conversion? A Jew? A heathen? And why are your children baptized before you hear of their conversion? Is it so that they could be baptized heathens? Is that so very important? What were you, yourself, before you were converted to the Lord? Was your baptism nothing, a witness of your dislike of the Lord, of His grace, of His service?

Concerning all kinds of heathens, even of cannibals, many will feel some pity, and many would even help by giving in order that

those may hear the gospel. But, concerning our own people that are estranged from the Lord and His Word, we do often feel dislike and hate; and many a time these people are left to themselves. It is possible that their ancestors were more shining believers than we are ourselves, and we know that baptism as a seal of the covenant of grace cannot be broken from God's side. By the same token, it may be that very soon your own children will be part of those we call baptized heathens.

Because of this, it is necessary that when we desire that our children and grand-children may be sanctified unto the Lord, it is not {117} enough to bring them and the next generation up in the fear of the Lord. But it is also absolutely necessary that our national environment and our national institutions must be Christian, in order that divine truth shall have a public face, and the means of grace shall be maintained and kept all around us.

Questions That Dishonor the Lord

Those who are baptized are, in their baptism, assured in every way of God's grace; they are overwhelmed by it. And the reformed churches teach that those that are baptized, as they grow up, are bound to receive further instruction in these things. This instruction, sad to say, is often not given. It is even so that some believers teach their children something entirely different; and because of this, they err themselves, and others with them. There are those in the church who are very carefully searching for whom Christ died, and furthermore whether or not there is a well meant offer of grace, or is it perhaps an offer not well meant?

When children are a few days old, they are baptized, and every time with the declaration that the Lord Jesus died no less for them than for adults. But when these same children become adults, and when they as men and women make up the church they are afraid to believe this declaration that was said of them when small, when baptized. People are afraid to say of adults what is still being said of infants that are being baptized. And quite often the best sermon is said to be suspect, because the pastor tells the adults what was already said of them when infants, namely that in Christ we have the washing away of our sins! When as infants we can ask for nothing, because we know nothing, the judgment of others may be

somewhat mild, and such an infant is placed upon a foundation of grace; but when he has become an adult, we become very serious and ask the question: did Christ die for him?

And still we continue to baptize children (the children of those of whom we are in doubt whether or not Christ died for them) proclaiming thereby that they are “received in grace” and are “heirs of God and His covenant.” Instead of instructing these children in the doctrine of the Lord, very often the thing is turned around and the child is taught to doubt the promises given in its baptism, and the grace of God is made out to be something that is not certain. What was certain in their baptism, becomes uncertain when they grow up! {118}

The Christian Day of Rest and the Uncovered Head

The Christian nation, with its day of rest as the symbol of rest restored by the reassurance of Christ, stands over against the Israelite with his day of *rest* begun in creation and covenant of works, which culminates in our Lord’s death. The Christian nation stands with the head uncovered when it prays and when it takes an oath (the servile Israelite to the contrary stands with his head covered, not so much as an evidence of reverence—for the Jew is not irreverent when he covers his head). [The Christian uncovers his head in prayer] as a token of the redemption in which he confesses to be a partaker, and because of which the Christian, as he stands redeemed, may appear thus before God as a free man.

Confusion

The confusion in the heart of man is never greater than when, being illuminated by God’s Spirit, he becomes aware of his guilt on the one hand and aware of the power of Christ’s sacrifice on the other. For some time, he will not be able to give all these new realities a place in his life and thinking. So also, is a Christian nation.

The cause of that confusion in the individual and by a people, at which we so often marvel, is very simple. The truth concerning our sin, redemption, and sanctification are not hard to write down on a lifeless sheet of paper. The human heart, however, is not like that. There we find debates and wrestlings taking place down into

the depths of the human will and mind. There in its application, the Holy Spirit battles against the prince of darkness; it is the same battle that Christ experienced in His death and resurrection, to bring us salvation. The fight against sin and darkness causes confusion all the time. And a condition of relative peace and regularity, be it in a people or individual, cannot be born but in proportion to the Christian awareness as it emerges out of the confusion.

What Does Baptism Seal?

Many think they are Christians because they believe they are such, that they are believers. This is a subjective approach and we are called upon to believe in the Triune God, the object of our faith.

Baptism, administered to adults or children, never seals unto us {119} that we are believers, but it seals what we have in God. The Lord does not tell us merely to believe that we love Him, but the Lord requires us to acknowledge [His love]. He says and seals what He will be for us, and waits patiently for our answer.

The Baptists are wrong when in baptism they seal subjective grace, and therefore only administer baptism to adults, because no one except the one who is baptized can know whether he/she possesses grace and is a believer; the church waits until it is told and accepts the confession in Christian charity. When someone is being baptized upon the ground of subjective faith, he does not receive a seal of God, but rather seals himself. Such a seal will be uncertain, and should be often repeated, as it rests upon the changing moods and convictions of the one baptized concerning his state of grace and is not grounded in sovereign grace and God's faithfulness.

Baptism administered to adults or infants who as yet do not belong to the church, never seals that which we have within, but always that which we have (or may have) in God. Faith is not faith because we believe first, but because our hope is in God. It is exactly because of this that baptism has the character of a seal, is a pledge, and is the beginning of a covenant relationship between God and man, and of life which has its foundation in the death and resurrection of Christ. The object of our faith is certain

and immovable. So it should be possible for the subjects, the individuals, the churches and people to free themselves, by faith in the object, from boundless confusion and develop into Christian awareness.

The Doctrine of the Reformed Church is Pre-eminently Generous

The doctrine of the reformed church sets all those baptized, without distinction, upon a foundation of overflowing grace and in an absolute covenant relationship with the Triune God. We must see by whom this commonly received baptism is appreciated or not appreciated and so make a distinction. All those baptized are called upon to examine themselves whether they live as covenant keepers. Abounding grace and perfect redemption are in baptism assured and sealed unto us by a Triune, covenanting God. What is so dangerous in believing this? Is it not much more dangerous not to believe this because of being narrow-minded or indifferent? Far from believing that all those baptized are taken up in a one-sided covenant, they are to the contrary admonished and obliged unto a new obedience. And here too we see evidence of the biblical {120} character of reformed doctrine. “With Thee is forgiveness, that Thou mayest be feared” (Psalm 130:4).

New Obedience

The old obedience to the covenant of works was not obeyed because fallen man could not and would not be subject to God’s law. The covenant of works was broken by man, and resulted in death and slavery. In all his attempts man was a slave and could not escape death. The Lord requires a new obedience because in baptism He seals unto us that He accepts us as His children and heirs; a new obedience which, for both young and old, begins with the life of the resurrection in Christ, because He suffered and died for our sins in our place, a new obedience—when we “let the Lord work in us by His Holy Spirit” (Heidelberg Catechism, Question 103), “imparting to us that which we have in Christ, namely the washing away of our sins and the daily renewing of our lives” (from the form for infant baptism).

When we are stingy concerning forgiveness, redemption and

grace, new obedience is altogether impossible. New obedience proceeds only from yielding self to redemption, as it exists in forgiveness and sanctification. There is no regeneration and renewal by the Holy Spirit, other than that which results in the dying of the old man, a dying with Christ by faith in His atoning work; and in a resurrection of the new man, a resurrection with Christ, by faith in His resurrection for our justification.

The Future of Baptism

The future of circumcision was in the atonement which Christ was to bring in His own sacrifice. When that future had come, circumcision came to an end. But where circumcision came to an end, there baptism began. The future of baptism lies in the complete application of the obtained redemption, when the whole church, by the power of the blood of the everlasting covenant with soul and body completely regenerated, shall stand before the Lord.

A Narrow and Abstract View of The Doctrine of Predestination

The doctrine of predestination is expressly revealed in the Bible. {121} However, the Lord does not teach us an abstract doctrine of election so that we as children of dust and time would afflict ourselves by attempting to climb up into heaven to find whether we are personally chosen unto salvation or not. To the contrary, God in His eternal predestination, which belongs to His right of majesty and flows out of His eternal sovereignty, in order that we would be able to understand, has introduced His covenant of grace into time and His economy into this world, that we may hold on to this covenant of grace and *in this way* may climb up to know our predestination.

But what reveals itself to the contrary to those of a limited persuasion? A one-sided appreciation of an abstract doctrine of election and an almost complete denial of the covenant of grace, continuing to contemplate God's eternal counsel, and an almost complete ignorance concerning the [application of the] covenant of grace [in time]; placing self in a beginningless eternity, while we are children of time which has a beginning. The result of this is that not one truth is rightly appreciated; least of all the truth which they

think most important. Because of this narrow view, they neglect the covenant of grace. And the nature of faith, God's leading with humanity and the strength and character of the means of grace are hard to be recognized. What should the world and even the churches as they exist be taught to believe? That people are saved when they are elected? The question remains. how shall I know that I am elect? Why do we read in God's Word of His judgments and His blessings upon earth, that He threatens and is angry, that He blesses and makes promises to lead men to repentance? Is it not so that God knows that only the elect shall be saved? What are the means of grace in relation to an immediate predestination? A maybe? A lottery where some gain a prize, but the majority remains as it is? A lottery ticket which makes it possible, but in no way certain, that the prize I love so much shall be mine?

The Lord has placed us in His covenant of grace in order that we by His grace, and in communion with Him, shall be comforted and *walk* in the future hope of eternal glory. Increasingly we should learn to understand that the means as well as the results are the fruits of His free and eternal election; and that the way for us to come to full assurance of faith is by *the life of faith itself*. But the narrow-minded take away this infallible certainty, which the Lord, to help us, has laid in the covenant of grace, and they place the convicted sinner directly over against an abstract predestination.

What to do now? There is no end of doubt concerning a personal share in the grace of God. The certainty which the Lord has given us {122} here on earth, and still gives, is being taken away by the self-willed obstinacy of man, and nothing remains but to climb up into heaven and to look for immediate and extraordinary assurances, that one has found grace in the sight of God.

The invention of a whole system of special assurances, sealings, revelations and appearances, of which not one is valid, has become the result. Because of this, too many of God's dear children are being kept in great uncertainty concerning their salvation.

The Vine

The church, seen in its true strength as an institution of the Lord, is the body of Christ. To be incorporated into that body is to be incorporated into Christ Himself. The child is by baptism

incorporated into the holy catholic church. He is being placed from nature into grace. As a child of Adam, he comes to baptism in order that he shall rise from baptism as a child of God. And so Christ has been objectively given to this child as well as to all the church, with all the means of grace (Heilsgoederen).

In order that this grace may enter a tender and young branch subjectively, this branch is bound to acknowledge God's fatherly goodness and mercy, which the Lord in objective but, nevertheless, very positive grace, has been pleased to give. The future of this young branch, as of all the other branches, is pictured in the words of Jesus. "I am the true vine, and my father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he purgeth it that it may bear more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken to you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch can not bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit. for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned" (John 15:1-6). The church is not made up of individuals who believe. No, the church of all the earth (all those baptized in the name of the Triune God, the catholic Christian church, continuation, extension and development of the church) is an organic, continually developing whole of which Christ is the life and power. It brings forth strong and living branches as well as weak and dead branches.

Children that have been recently baptized, as well as growing children, are the tender branches in Christ, the Vine. We do not know whether they will remain in Him, whether they shall bear fruit or not. {123} God Almighty, who works all things after the counsel of His own will, knows whether they shall remain in Him and bear fruit or shall fall away. We rejoice that the Holy Spirit has taken them in distinction of millions of children of Jew and Gentile, and has incorporated them into Christ as branches of the Vine through baptism.

Is it not better to pray with the reformed church that the Lord may protect these branches, and rule them by His Holy Spirit; that He may grant that these children be nurtured in the Christian faith and godliness, in order that these tender branches, just engrafted

into Christ, but not rooted in Him, may grow and increase in the Lord Jesus Christ; that they shall not be dry but green and living branches; that they may show this by recognizing His fatherly goodness and mercy which He has shown us and all of His church by giving Christ to us, and us to Christ?

A Sad Peculiarity

It is a sad thing in our day that we should take God's institutions, which He shall certainly maintain and uphold for those who believe, and change and deform them into a caricature, and after this to ask the question. "Do you believe this?"

Many have made an attempt to take the glorious day of rest, the symbol of the relation between heaven and earth, and make it into a day of pleasure and play, and then ask the faithful. "Is God pleased to make this special day, a day of being idle and lazy?" In the same way, unbelievers in the church have blamed the church for unbelief, superstition and the unrighteousness of their own kind, and made a mockery of the church by asking if being just a member of the church has saving power. It is the same with baptism, especially the baptism of infants. We do not believe that baptism has any subjective, grace-bringing power. The child is the same after baptism as it was before; with this distinction, that now it is sacramentally laid down and surrounded by the never-failing promises of God. And that it does not seek its salvation in Adam, but in Christ; not by nature but by grace.

The groundwork has been laid; all it has to do now is to adhere to further development in order "that it finally be presented without spot among the assembly of the elect in life eternal."

PAUL, THE CHURCH, AND SOCIAL ORDER

Romans 13:1–7

J. Daryl Charles

Introduction

The first seven verses of Romans 13 are integral to a portion of the epistle which is markedly different from the initial eleven chapters. Particularly in this pericope, Paul waxes very “local” as he sets forth practical implications of the theology he has so deliberately expounded.

To the majority of Second Testament critics, 13:1–7 is considered to be Pauline in character. A survey of the terminology and concepts contained therein shows it to be purely Pauline. Apart from J. Kallas (365–74), who considered 13:1–7 to be an insertion into the letter, there has been no serious attempt to question the paragraph’s authenticity. R. Bultmann (197–202), ever on the search for “glosses,” maintained 13:5 to be such, although Bultmann seemingly attributed everything to a gloss which did not agree with his theology.

There is another view of the state in the Second Testament. Revelation 13 and 2 Thessalonians 2:1–12, where it is pictured as under inspiration from the devil. The political “beast” of John’s *Apocalypse* had usurped its entrusted authority, requiring its own {126} name to be written on one’s forehead. The state had thereby symbolized that its authority had *replaced* the authority of God. One senses an increased tendency toward emperor worship as one read John’s *Apocalypse*. Jesus’ titles of “King of Kings” and “Lord of Lords” reflect this, since the *Lamb alone* is worthy (Rev. 4:11; 5:2,

4, 9, 12).

Regarding Paul's seemingly positive attitude toward the state in Romans, some are quick to point out that the epistle was written before the intense persecutions of the Christians began. Yet several years later, after Paul's death and during a time of serious persecution, an exhortation to the Christians in light of the civil authorities remains the same. 1 Peter 2:13–17, which indeed would affirm the authenticity of Romans 13:1–7. Revelation 13 and Romans 13 illustrate an important principle, namely the necessity of interpreting biblical writers according to the historical situation. One should refrain from trying to mix, for example, Paul's allusion to the state in 2 Thessalonians 2 and Romans 13 in order to come up with a "beef stew" showing one theological formula regarding the state. Similarly, Paul's use of the term "law" in Galatians is vastly different from that in Romans.

The issue for Paul in Romans 13:1–7 is divinely appointed functions and a lifestyle of obedience which issues out of this knowledge. If the *norm* of the Christian's behavior is to oppose the civil authorities, then chances are that the attitude is wrong. Rather, one's attitude should be characterized by good deeds (13:3, 4) and obedience (13:1, 5), the likes of which take on a very *public* expression. Earlier, Paul had written to Christians elsewhere in the Empire—to Corinthian believers—and expressed the very same concern for conduct before the public authorities (see I Corinthians 6). For the apostle, it was a monstrosity that so-called "Christians" should be airing their grievances with one another before the watching world.

It has become the inclination of most commentators to consider 13:1–7 as a Christian "doctrine of the state" or Paul's theory of government. Reasons for the perplexing nature of the text at hand and our agonizing over it are intensified by the events in Europe from 1933–1945, i.e., unquestioning obedience to the Third Reich, or, subjection to atheistic Communist regimes. However, these ignore the particular situation to which Paul was speaking. The Church in Rome at AD 57 was not the mistress of the state as she was in Germany fifty years ago. To interpret 13:1–7 in light of pre-war Europe is to do injustice to Paul's intent. In the same way, many modern commentators fail to consider the "*Sitz im Leben*" or historical {127} setting of the so-called "Sermon on the

Mount” and thereby misconstrue Jesus to be discussing ethical implications of the military or a national civil defense policy, when in reality He was addressing matters of the individual heart. This is a typical example of bringing personal “agendas” to the text instead of allowing the text to speak for itself.

The question at hand in Romans 13:1–7 is not civil government *per se*, rather *Christian conduct*, i.e., good behavior, in the face of political realities. We would do well to note what themes 13:1–7 does *not* deal with:

- the abuse of power by the authorities.
- the divinizing of governmental authority.
- the persecution of Christians on the basis of faith.
- civil disobedience on the basis of conscience.
- Christians holding public office.

The problem throughout history has not been the text itself, rather the history of its interpretation, i.e., the general political climate mirrored during these periods. Unfortunately, most of the modern arguments have to do with the theological implications of “the state” which are brought *to* the text—*eisegesis*, if you will—but not given by Paul himself.

Contextual Observations

A frequent contention among commentators has been that 13:1–7 is an isolated, self-contained unit in the epistle (e.g., Kuss. 247, Käsemann. 198–99, and Michel. 280–81). And although Paul’s statements concerning the authorities *are* distinct as a unit, they form nonetheless a definite contextual link between 12:17–2, and 13:8–10. Note that both 12:17–2, and 13:1–7 deal with the relationship of the Christian to outsiders. Further, “doing good” is a common thread throughout the whole of 12:17–13:10. The admonition to “not do evil” (in 12:17–21) and to “do good” (in 13:1–7) are fully in line with the “love” motif of 13:8–10. (1) 12:17–2, finds its fulfillment before one’s enemies, (2) 13:1–7 finds its fulfillment before the authorities, and (3) 13:8–10 finds its fulfillment in the keeping of the Decalogue, the embodiment of what one might call “biblical law.”

A second element is carried over from 12:17–2, into chapter 13, showing the inter-relation of these units. that of divine wrath and recompense, which is foreshadowed by the civil authorities. Whereas vengeance in 12:19 belongs to God (“Vengeance is mine, I will {128} repay...”), in 13:4 the authorities act as an avenger for the purpose of exercising wrath on the one practicing evil.

Another link between 13:1–7 and the earlier parts of the epistle is the repetition of key words, almost all of which had been used in the previous eleven chapters. Alone in these seven verses are six words which appear three times each. “authorities,” “fear,” “good,” “evil” and the Greek proposition *eis*, which expresses purpose. Appearing twice in 13:1–7 are the verbs “submit,” one of two forms of “resist,” plus the terms “servant,” “wrath,” “custom,” and “honor.” We may even take note of the repetitive use of conjunctions in this paragraph. eight times in these seven verses Paul establishes reasons for a statement.

The beginning of this ethical or hortatory section of Romans is found in 12:–12, where the apostle exhorts his audience by “the mercies of God” to present themselves “a living sacrifice” to God, which is their “reasonable service.” A portion of that “reasonable service,” 13:1–7 is part of what is “good, well-pleasing and perfect” in doing the will of God.

There is yet one more reason for 13:1–7 fitting the immediate as well as general context of the epistle. that is the very theological substructure of the whole epistle which seems to emerge again and again. Christ spans the division between Jew and Gentile, breaking down any hostilities along national lines. And if, by any chance, any resentment “along national lines” is part of Paul’s reason for including a thought such as 13:1–7, it is probably with respect to the *Romans who rule*, and “wrath” and “the sword” will hopefully dampen any thought of rebellion. In public life, living peaceably with all will include personal enemies as well as those outside the church. In actuality, 12:18 (“as far as it depends on you, be at peace with all men”) could be a summary of 12:16b–13:7.

Hence, the position of 13:1–7 is important in demonstrating or correcting any erroneous applications of 12:17–21.

Internal Structure of 13:1–7

The foundation of Paul's argument lies in 13:1, repeated in 13:5, with verses 2–7 being merely the explanation and practical implications of his basic thesis. Breaking down 13:1–7, 13:1a represents the fundamental exhortation of submission to the authorities. "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities"; 13:1b–2 is the reasoning supporting this basic admonition with its logical results. "For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist stand having been determined by God. Therefore, he who {129} resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment." Additional reasoning is supplied in verses 3–5, building on verse 2 and introducing the "Christian distinctive": "For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to wrong. Would you be free from anxiety over against the one in authority? Then do what is good and you will receive his approval, for he is God's servant working for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword for nothing; for he is the servant of God, carrying out God's revenge by punishing those practicing wrong. That is why it is necessary to be subject to authorities, not only because of retribution, but also because of conscience."

In 13:6, we note practical evidence of Christian conduct, at which Paul is aiming. "This is also the reason you pay taxes, since the authorities are ministers of God, giving their full time to governing."

Verse 7 is essentially a conclusion to his argument and a bridge into the "love" motif which follows. "Pay all of them their dues, taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due." Again, we might note the connectives tying the building-blocks of Paul's argument together. "for," "this," "since," "indeed," "for," "for this reason," "on account of," "therefore," and "for."

Commentary

In Paul's opening statement, "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities," the interpreting of the term "authorities" has sparked some interesting debate in the past. Earlier in this century, O. Dibelius (210) and O. Cullmann (111) sought to

interpret the authorities” of 13:1 as demonic beings (historically, probably the first attempt at this kind of “angelic” interpretation was by Irenaeus as he sought to counter the early second century Gnostics). The basis for this interpretation in 13:1 was an attempt to be consistent with Paul’s usage elsewhere (e.g., in the plural it appears also in I Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians and Titus). Often in Pauline literature, authorities” occurs in a list of plurals—”rulers,” “principalities,” “thrones,” “lords,” etc.—where they are clearly demonic in reference. Further, such an interpretation would also be in keeping with the Hebrew concept of angelic powers behind earthly authorities (examples of this being found in Daniel or Jeremiah and Jewish apocalyptic literature such as the book of Enoch or the Apocalypse of Baruch).

However, most New Testament critics have come to acknowledge {130} Paul’s reference to “authorities” in Romans 13, as pertaining to *earthly* rulers and magistrates. From the text itself, it is clear that demonic powers are not a “servant” of Christ (v. 4), at least voluntarily, nor are Christians to “submit” themselves under demonic rule (vv. 1, 5), and, lastly, Christians cannot pay their taxes to them, much less, honor and respect (v. 7).

Enlisting subjection to the authorities in 13:1a, Paul has his eye on the Roman Imperium, the magistrates and rules, i.e., the concrete reality of the state. To a Hellenistic audience, *exousia* (“authorities”) would have conveyed earthly rulers. 1 Peter 2:13–17 also speaks of the very same state apparatus. *basilei*, *huperechonti*, *hegemosin* and *basilea* (the king or emperor, “superior” rulers). Those ruling on a local level possessed a fair amount of autonomy, though at any time they were subject to the over-rule of the Roman procurator or proconsul. Each procurator, autonomous in his own respect, accounted ultimately to the Caesar. Essentially, three tasks constituted the function of the procurator in the Roman province. military defense, the administration of justice and the supervision of taxes (Foerster: 97).

Here in the realm of the practical, Paul is most at home. Because the offices of the ruling authorities were almost without exception filled by non-Christians, it would actually be surprising had Paul *not* included in his epistle a word concerning the believer’s attitude toward the state. The Roman authorities would quite naturally be viewed by Jewish and Gentile Christians as the structural organ

of the world's system, a part of Satan's dominion, and, therefore, despised. A fundamental question of theory would have been. Should the heathen exercise power over the children of God?

Paul's choice of verb in 13:1a is *hupotassestho* ("let him be subject"), a present imperative in the passive voice of *hupotasso* ("to submit or subject," "to place or order under"). Paul is not commenting on some abstract notion of the state, but the dally reality of the magistrates placed over them. "Being subject," furthermore, was not merely a political disposition; it was a relationship which necessitated a knowledge of the order of relationships in the created universe. The present participle translated as "governing" or "superior," *huperechousais*, denotes superiority, not in the absolute sense of the emperor himself, rather in a comparative sense, as being set above the people (apart from whether his character is moral or immoral). 1 Timothy 2:2 would help define this, where virtually the same idiom is used as Timothy is exhorted in the context of corporate gatherings to pray for "all men," "kings" and "those in high places" (as some {131} versions render it).

Of the four Greek verbs in the New Testament which denote "obedience," Paul uses all four. C.E.B. Cranfield (660), in his International Critical Commentary on Romans, remarks that it is wise for us not to attempt to explain away the notion of "obey" so that we only see a joint reciprocity between the state and the Christian, as is so characteristic of the modern era. The term "to submit," *hupotassó*, is to be understood in terms of God's *taxis*, i.e. God's *order*, arrangement or "fixed succession." The *hupotagè* or "submission" of 13:1-7 points back to creation and the theological reality of varying levels of authorities in the universe which influence the everyday life of the Christian.

Yet, the term does not mean uncritical blindness; for 13:2 states that judgment is meted out finally by God, by Whom all authority exists. Moreover, Paul had just asserted in 12:18 the following qualification with regard to one's enemies: "as much as it depends on you." In other words, he is assuming that one's enemy could attempt to invoke a response which would violate the will of God, in which case, then, it should be plainly resisted. Unfortunately, most readers and commentators fail to see 13:1 in the light of 12:18, that which Paul had already penned. The apostle never

argues for blind obedience. He does, however, see authority as part of creation and a moral universe.

Observing this connection between 12:18 and 13:1 would remove much emotion from interpreting our text. Added to this are the many distorted modern views arising when we hear the term “submit.” Scripturally speaking, submission to authority contains the idea of protection, not oppression. Unfortunately, a bad experience with one’s father or mate, or even one’s personal agenda, will most often have a stronger bearing on the interpretation of a text such as this than honest exegesis.

The expression “every soul,” which opens the pericope, strongly suggests the question of *individual* duty. This expression has already been used by Paul in 2:9, where he speaks of “distress for every soul who does evil.”

Thus, in 13:1a, Paul states his fundamental exhortation. “Let every individual be in subjection to the governing authorities.” This imperative is not left alone without establishment. “...for there is no authority outside of God, and those existing have been instituted by God.” This strong negation in 13:1b, in effect, yields the strong affirmation of 13:1a, and two elements of this reasoning are crucial. the prepositional phrase *hupo theou*, “by God,” and the verb {132} *tetagmenai*, “having been ordained.” Six times in 13:1–7 Paul will use the genitive *theou* in order that he might firmly establish the finality and sovereignty of God (twice in v. 1, once in v. 2, twice in v. 4 and once in v. 6). It is from God that the authorities receive their dignity, irrespective of whether “good” or “bad” men fill those offices. Even unworthy culpable men will be used to fulfill the divine plan. “By God” is the deepest reason for a Christian’s obedience.

Such a notion that the rulers of the nations were the instrument of God is prominent in Jewish tradition. The prophet Jeremiah declares Nebuchadnezzar to be the servant of Yahweh at least four times. Yahweh “removes and sets up” kings (Daniel 2), granting dominion and power to them. He gives rule over kings (Isa. 41) and anointed Cyrus King of Persia to “subdue nations” (Isa. 45). Wisdom literature confirms frequently the notion of divine sovereignty (e.g., Proverbs 8, 21, 24 as well as Wisdom 6).

For Paul, the Sovereign Lord is the source of all authority. Romans 13:1 agrees with Jesus’ statement before Pilate in John

19:11. “You have no authority over me except what is given to you from above.” Since Christ the Lord is the post-resurrection message, God’s claim over governments of the world has been decisively asserted. Earthly rulers *will* be held accountable (an axiom accented by the *diakonos* imagery of 13:4).

In that “the existing powers” are described as literally “having been ordained,” they are considered “godly institutions” in the sense that they have been determined *hupo theou*. *Tetagmenai*, the perfect passive participial form of the verb *tassō* (Paul will use four forms of *tassō* in these seven verses), accentuates the fact that they were ordained in the past while their effects continue validated into the present.

Verse 2 is essentially a result or conclusion of verse 1. “Resistance” (*antitassō*) is opposing God, with the result of incurring God’s judgment, God’s *krima*. Paul is not legitimizing every form of government, *rather* he is admonishing Christians toward a lifestyle of good deeds, using a reminder of God’s eschatological intervention. The issue here is not the “right to resist,” rather the relationship between submission and judgment. The consequences for opposing this precept is that one opposes God Himself, and condemnation ensues.

The Claudius edict of AD 41, responsible for the expulsion of at least some Jews from Rome and recorded by Suetonius, seems to give some indication of controversy arising from the direction of the {133} synagogues. This was responsible for the initial departure of Prisca and Aquila from Rome, as is mentioned in Acts 18:2. The “house churches” of Romans 16:5 and implicit in 16:16 might suggest a gradual return of Jews to Rome. Certainly, hostility stemming from the edict would not be easily forgotten, and Rome would view both Jews and Christians as the supposed root of the disturbances. J. Murphy-O’Connor (136) reminds us that it was not legally possible to expel Jews who were Roman citizens and conjectures that only certain “missionary” types were expelled who lacked Roman citizenship. Based on texts from Philo and Josephus, Claudius had a fairly positive attitude toward Jews throughout the Empire. Murphy-O’Connor contends that the Claudius edict was foremost for the maintenance of social *order*, not due to antagonism toward the Jews.

Hence, Paul is seeking to quench any tendency toward

opposing or rebelling against the authorities. To oppose them is to incur God's judgment. *Krima* carries a heavenly and an earthly connotation in the New Testament. The Semitic expression translating "to incur judgment" appears also in Mark 12, Luke 20, and James 3, the latter being a sober warning to teachers that theirs will be a stricter judgment.

The whole book of Acts indeed seems to confirm Paul's basic assertion in 13:1 and 2. God worked *through* the authorities. And only when the Christians were forced to disobey God did they "resist."

With 13:3, Paul builds on the argument of verse 2 with additional reasoning. He combines elements of Hellenistic-Roman and Jewish tradition, doing good as a citizen, and the contrast of good and evil. Thus, political dealings, i.e., the ruling authorities, and God's authority are not unrelated. Paul is not introducing a new axiom in verse 3, rather he is explaining *why* people incur wrath, why the authorities wield power, why the world as divine creation must mirror order, why the Christian is under obligation (van Unnik: 341).

The dualism of praise and punishment is part of Hellenistic history and represents an antithesis beloved by the Greeks. One can therefore assume that this contrast which appears in 13:3 was a known rule in Paul's day. "Fear stands in direct relationship to "judgment" of verse 2. The authorities do not hunt for evil. They simply arouse *phobos*. The "rulers" of 13:3 are the "authorities" of 13:1, whose function it is to strike fear in the party doing "evil" (*kakos*), not the one doing "good" (*agathos*). The citizen who fulfills his responsibility regarding civil authorities has "nothing to fear." The {134} apostle leaves it in the hands of each individual.

The "praise" mentioned by Paul had its antecedent in a very forceful practice in the cities of the Roman Empire. Reports were sent to towns and cities from the Caesar, addressed to the local authorities and citizens, and read aloud. Numerous examples of this are available from antiquity. e.g., a letter from Tiberius Caesar in AD 15 to the inhabitants of the town of Cos, mentioned in Acts 21:1 (Cos was a small island along the southwest coast of Asia Minor and was famous for its temple of Asklepios, the Greek god of medicine); or, a letter dated AD 118 from Hadrian to some citizens of Rhodes (Strobel: 81–83).

Such was the custom in the Empire, to praise submitted behavior, political loyalty and zealous service through official letters. And Paul uses this technique in his own writings. I Corinthians 11:2 (“I praise you...”), also 11:17 and 22, and Philippians 4:8.

When Paul speaks in terms of “doing good,” he is speaking in known categories of his day. Hence, “doing good” is a paradigm for Christian behavior based on a contemporary ideal. The contrast of good to evil appears nine times in the Second Testament and six of these occur in Romans (Schmoller: 262).

Twice in verse 4, the “authorities” are designated as a “servant of God,” a concept which has stirred no little commotion throughout the history of this text’s interpretation.

C.K. Barrett (246) notes that, at Paul’s writing, *diakonos* was in the process of becoming a Christian “technical” term; thus its weight when used here. That Paul uses the term forty-six times (Schmoller: 115–16) in his letters is indeed notable. He had used it in chapter 12 regarding spiritual gifts, then later in chapter 16 in his commendation of Phoebe’s service in Cenchrea. In line with the Christian sense of “servant,” the representatives of the state also have a significant role, alongside the church, in the fulfillment of God’s divine purposes.

In what sense, then, is the authority a “servant” or “deacon”? By carrying out a temporal provisional manifestation of God’s wrath against evil. by “avenging for the purpose of wrath the one practicing evil” (13:4e). The state is the servant of God in the world, for positive and negative service (praise and punishment), and God is *not* dependent on the state’s *awareness* of the divine plan. Already in 8:28, Paul had alluded to this incredible phenomenon. beyond the comprehension by the human mind lay the sovereign design, and for the Christian, it is “good.” This is repeated in 13:4: “to you for the purpose of good.” {135}

The antithesis of grace and judgment was introduced at the beginning of the epistle in chapter 1: punishment followed sin, which was, according to Paul, rejecting knowledge of God. For this reason, God “gave them up” to their consequences (1:24, 26, 28). For Paul, the issue is not a vindictive God, rather a God Who takes very seriously the independence from *His authority*. We should note the incidence of *orgē* (“wrath”) in the epistle. eleven times, one-third of all New Testament occurrences. Wrath is

clearly a divine attribute, and Paul is going out of his way to say this is not simply random “cause-and-effect” activity, rather *divine involvement*. Romans 1:18, “For the wrath of God is revealed...,” is in accordance with God’s nature; He resists evil upon earth.

“Divine law,” then, must be reflected in the cosmos. Paul is very much in favor of justice—divine *and* civil (note his terms. *phobos* (v. 3), *krima* (v. 2), *ekdikos* (v. 4) and *orgē* (vv. 4–5). Earthly penal justice is an identification with and shadow of eschatological justice rendered in finality. 13:3–4 links earthly wrath to the heavenly. Paul had just used the verb “avenge” in 12:19 to prohibit *personal* retribution, but now he is qualifying and approving the “setting right in injustice” on a collective or societal basis, for it is a God-ordained function of the authorities.

A rhetorical question has been posed in verse 3. “Would you be free from anxiety over against the one in authority?” The authorities are no deterrent for the worker of good; they are, however, for those doing wrong. How? “He bears the sword.” A variety of interpretations as to the meaning of “the sword” are offered by commentators. These include. (1) power to maintain order and coerce obedience, (2) ability to make war and to crush rebellion, (3) a juridical technical term, (4) justification for capital punishment, (5) a symbol for power over life and death. What few commentators seek to undertake, however, is the relationships of ideas in Paul’s thought.

Mention of “the sword” follows the antithesis of good and evil, fear of punishment and praise (in v. 3). Seen in this context, the “sword” is the concrete means of executing the reason for the “fear” of 13:3, avenging evil (v. 4). It maintains “order,” retarding evil. Our interpretation of “the sword” must not be separated from Paul’s qualifying terms. *ekdikos* (“avenger) and *eis orgē* (“for the purpose of wrath”) in context. And, it is the sword of the *magistrate*, not the Roman soldier, as some commentators would maintain. The issue is social constraint, not war or *symbolism of Roman might*. The sword helps prevent evil deeds and is a foreshadow of the judgment of God. The “judgment” of verse 2 represents the *divine* expression of {136} divine wrath, while the “sword” of verse 4 represents the *human* expression of divine wrath. Under pagan law, specifically a case law of the Hammurabi Code, if a man killed your son, the proper punishment would be for the state to kill, not

the man himself, but *his son* (Daube: 163).

However, Paul is not saying the state may freely dispose of human life at random. There is a difference between “the magistrate bears the sword not in vain” (v. 4) and “the magistrate holds the keys to life and death” (such as is ascribed to Jesus in Rev. 1:18). Nonetheless, the implication of 13:4 is that by *not* punishing criminals, the state is not acting as the “servant of God,” because then evil-doers are being “praised,” nullifying “the good” in society.

According to the situation, the Caesar and the state were not *bound* by standing law; they could invoke punishment at will. As well, the governors in the provinces could act according to personal judgment and since the time of Augustus, the “sword” was given over to the governors in the provinces for the execution of penal justice. Known in Roman law as the *jus gladii*, capital punishment was invoked over murder, false witness, adultery by women, and arson; and execution was carried out through beheading, crucifixion, fire, wild animals in a public forum and the sword (Mommsen: 911–4, 1045).

It is noteworthy that /he sword” is mentioned in the same context as the Mosaic commandment “Do not murder” (v. 9). Immediately after having approved of the state’s use of the sword to punish wrong-doers, Paul reminds the individual that to shed a man’s blood incurs God’s wrath. Old Testament law is still in force. The heart of Old Testament law was that man was the image of God (note God’s instructions to Noah following the flood in Genesis 9:6). Murder, according to biblical law, is the ultimate rebellion against God’s authority. Thus, it is all the more important that civil magistrates reward the good and punish the evil, as Romans 13:4 indicates.

It is interesting that from the verb translated *to bear (pherō), as in “to bear the sword” (v. 4), the term for “tax” or “tribute” (phoros) is derived. Both noun and verb forms appear within two verses of each other. This is perhaps not accidental, since soldiers normally accompanied tax-collectors.

Verse 5 begins with the seventh argumentative conjunction of the passage. “therefore,” or, “for this reason.” “For this reason it is necessary to be under subjection....” Paul’s further reasoning contains two elements. “wrath,” a repetition of verse 4, and a new

{137} factor: “conscience.” For the Christian, obedience proceeds out of two motives: fear of wrath (known as *part* of the nature of God), a “negative” motivation common to all unbelievers, and the Christian “distinctive”—a sense of obligation which arises out of a sensitivity to truth (described vividly in chapter 1), a “positive” motivation. Paul is actually building on an earlier statement—in 2:15—where he defined “conscience” in terms of knowledge of the truth.

Conscience and wrath are bound together in the Roman epistle. According to Paul, wrath is the inevitable result of man’s inclination toward sin in a moral universe. It is the over-stepping of one’s limits in the created order. It “suppresses the truth, what was known of God,” to use Paul’s words. The net result is that men are “without excuse” (1:20).

The link between “conscience” and “knowledge” is clearly delineated in the Roman epistle. The Christian “knows” of the divine ordinance in the existing political entities; and he “knows” it is to God that all authorities must account. The end of service to the rulers is when the conscience must deny or suppress revealed truth (1:18–19). And if the question of conscience does become life-endangering, Paul is our example again. His writings from a prison cell exhibit no bitterness or call to resist the state. He saw, unlike modern western man, the Gospel furthered in such a lot (Phil. 1). Of anyone, it was Paul who could have written very inspiring essays on the nuances of “liberation,” particularly when he considered in his day the lot of slaves, Jews, women or even *apostles!* Yet for him, “liberation” was fundamentally “spiritual.” For Paul, freedom began and ended at the cross, where Jew and Gentile, slave and free, found liberty. And Paul knew that with time, a society would feel the social impact of true, “liberated,” Christian community, for like yeast-culture, which permeates the whole of the dough, the Christian community would slowly transform the society in which it lived.

Romans 13:5, then, establishes a relationship between conscience and wrath, showing an external constraint as well as the inner. We should bear in mind that the verses which immediately follow 1–7 allude to the “Law.” There is a genuine theological connection between conscience and law. The “Law” measured what sin is, and condemned it. It was, according to

chapter 2, the Jews' possession of the Law which caused them to become judgmental of others. In the eyes of the prophet Jeremiah, the New Covenant was envisioned as "the law written on men's hearts" (Jer. 31:33). Thus, for the Christian, conscience should be the dominate force instigating {138} action. "Conscience" is a constraint (13:5a) worked by God through knowledge of a God-ordered world. It knows that the state is a servant of God, and no more. Nothing in 13:1-7 suggests a stronger case for submission and recognition of divine authority vested in civil government than "for conscience sake." "Conscience" seems to have been a catchword in Paul's Corinthian letters. In his writings, he employs it twenty times, whereas in the four Gospels and all of Johannine literature, it does not appear at all (Schmoller: 471).

As a citizen, the Christian is lifted onto a higher plain due to the sphere of "conscience."

After the development of his thought, Paul makes his teaching amazingly concrete by touching his audience where they live, addressing the delicate issue of paying taxes. Implicit in the "order" motif running throughout 13:1-7 is the individual's obligation as a citizen to support the structural organ of society to which he belongs. An orderly state incurs costs to be maintained, and each member of the household shares his part in the maintenance. This seems to be the immediate context and reason for such a thought as 13:6-7. "For this reason," i.e., for the maintenance of order alluded to in verses 1-5, the authorities are "ministers of God," literally "devoted" to the whole office of public service. That the rulers function as the "servants" or "ministers" of God (note the "servant" language of vv. 4 and 6) does not mean that a religious connotation is applied to the state. Paul's term for "ministers" was a common designation for holders of public office which performed in the interest of the general public. Whether involved in village-, city-, or finance-management, all were ministers of God," even without knowledge of such.

The earliest appearance of the Greek *leitourgia* or "ministry" in democratic Greece had to do with the collection of moneys. Eventually, the term became associated with *any* public service. In the Septuagint, the term occurs roughly one hundred times and refers most frequently to the priests and Levites in the temple service.

How much tax money should actually be rendered to Caesar? Paul does not stipulate. Rather, he compares it to another debt of greater proportion, that of love (vv. 8–10). Taxes in this context, reflect the individual's debt toward all just as love reflects a common debt. Paul is *not* saying, "Let yourselves be fleeced," rather, "Render what is due." Taxes are a means of recognizing the authorities, and on account of conscience the Christian can submit and pay respect. The treasury officials also fulfill a role of ministers of God. {139}

The sense of "debt" is communicated by *tas opheilias*, "the things which are due," in verse 7. What are these "things" in Paul's eyes? Taxes, custom, fear and honor. Christian freedom does not excuse us from the debt to obey, or to love.

Jews had paid taxes for centuries under the reign of the Persians, and later under the Ptolemies and Seleucids. However, under Roman rule, a new "doctrine" appeared among the Jews that paying Roman taxes was an infringement of the First Commandment (note what directly follows verse 7: the commandments!). The issue for those in the "Zealot" movement, which was to go underground much like the Maccabean Revolt earlier during Syrian domination of Palestine, was the recognition of Roman sovereignty.

Two types of direct tax or "tribute" (Latin: *tribute*), estimated at between 30 and 40 percent, plus a custom levied at provincial borders, were due the Empire. Zacchaeus (Luke 19) would have operated at a border region as a "chief tax collector." He then would "farm out" the right to collect these individually at various posts. In order to maintain exact tax management throughout the Empire, a form of registration was carried out through which one's address and earning capability were reported. An example of this is also found in Luke 2, while Quirinius was the Roman procurator over Syria.

The coin with Caesar's image on it showed that Caesar had governing authority over commerce and business, a fact which Jesus had not denied. Paul, in spite of the daily reminder on the potential for exploitation by the state, sees an expression of loyalty and responsibility in paying taxes (and we need to keep in mind that Rome could have a heavy debtor killed). It is interesting that Paul's word in verse 7 is "give over" (*apodidō mi*), and not simply "give" (*didōmi*), reflecting the idea of obligation as opposed to

voluntarism, and agrees with his expression “the things due” in the same verse.

The Christian, then, shows evidence of his submission to the Sovereign God by two means. (1) paying taxes, and (2) respect or “fear.” While these two are not all-inclusive, they are representative of a greater debt: *agapē*. The “taxes,” “custom,” “fear” and “honor” all indicate a debt due the earthly authorities. Already in 13:3, Paul had asked, “Would you not fear the authorities?” He is in no way propounding a “fear” motif concerning the state, rather fear in the sense of respect or honor.

Conclusion

So often we have difficulty understanding Pauline exhortations [140] and ethical injunctions simply because we do not discern their historical presuppositions. Paul was not seeking to deal with the issue of civil disobedience in a corrupt or unjust order. Nor was he writing a manifesto for the church’s relationship to governments for all centuries. Romans 13:1–7 requires caution in exegesis due to the specific elements of its historical situation. the question of the Christian and the first century Roman authorities (the Caesar, the governors, the tax-collectors), the apparent unrest in the Roman synagogues due to the messianic message and subsequent need for unity among Gentile and Jewish Christians, plus the regular dilemma of taxation.

Paul’s concern could be summed up as being twofold. (1) sober conduct as opposed to rebellious tendencies while living within the Empire, particularly in the Imperial seat, and (2) furthering the cause of Christ. It is very likely that Paul foresaw Antioch, Ephesus and Rome as the emerging centers of Christian influence. And if he saw Rome as a “sending station” to the west (note in chapter 15 that Paul makes clear his intent to go to Spain as the “apostle to the Gentiles”), the Roman church would certainly be strategic.

Many commentators feel Paul’s uncharacteristically positive attitude toward the state in Romans 13 is due to his “positive” experience with it (noting that the first five years of Nero’s reign were comparatively mild). However, by the time of this writing, he had encountered enough trouble personally through the

authorities which would thoroughly repudiate any such notion.

Let us note specific instances:

Acts 16, Paul and Silas are dragged before the magistrates in Philippi for “disturbance,” upon which the magistrates tear their garments and order them to be beaten.

Romans 8, Paul asks rhetorically whether the things encountered could possibly separate him from the love of Christ. tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness or the sword?

2 Corinthians 6, His experience included affliction, hardship, calamities, beatings, tumults, imprisonments, hard labors, hunger and watches.

2 Corinthians 1, Far greater, if the apostle is allowed to boast, were his hard labors, imprisonments, countless beatings, often {141} being near death, five times receiving forty lashes, three times with rods, once being stoned, etc. (of the whole list, these are directly related to the “authorities”).

Therefore, when a commentator says that Paul was on a honeymoon with the state, he is not interpreting the biblical record honestly. Paul was a committed realist who gave himself to one thing. the preaching of the Gospel. And it is this very motive which we hear when we read 1 Timothy 2, in which the apostle enlists prayer for the authorities (2:1–6).

While we are careful to interpret 13:1–7 according to its historical situation, it is not unjust to consider contemporary Christian attitudes toward governing authorities in light of the text. What are the truths of its contents?

1. *That all authority flows from God and that He is the Sovereign Lord over nations and Judge of individual men and nations.*
2. *That submission is not some dreaded fate, rather a relationship which is part of the created order and is related to final judgment; and since God's rule is a kingdom and not a democracy, all subjects give account.*
3. *That praise for doing well and punishment for doing wrong are part of the maintenance of social order.*
4. *That rulers are a servant, a **diakonos**, of God and that they are*

accountable to Him.

5. *That by not punishing wrong-doers, a society encourages wrongdoing.*

6. *That wrath is equally a part of God's unchanging moral nature (and we are the better for it).*

7. *That the Christian possesses the unique motivation to do right via conscience which responds to God.*

8. *That the Christian renders to the state its due, just as we owe a debt of love which cannot be eradicated.*

That the Christians of Paul's day knew more injustice than justice makes this text from Romans 13 all the more poignant. And, as we noted, Paul lived what he preached.

F. F. Bruce writes the following concerning Paul's attitude as well as the typical reader's reaction to Romans 13:1-7.

The emotional response which some readers make to this {142} paragraph arises very often from attempts made by themselves or others to apply its teaching without qualification to Christians living under a wide variety of political regimes today.... Paul ... was writing for the Christians in Rome (and no doubt for Christians in other cities of the empire).... He knew that the empire would not last forever; the State is to whither away; "the city of God remains." He knew, too, that when the State encroaches on the sphere that belongs to God, disobedience to its commands may be not only a Christian Tight but a Christian duty. But while the empire lasted, and while it discharged the ministry divinely committed to it, it should receive submission, not rebellion, from its Christian subjects. This is not only the teaching of Romans 13:1-7; it is the teaching of Paul himself (96).

Sources

- Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 1957. London. Adam & Charles Black.
- Bauer, W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, 1979. Chicago. University of Chicago, rep.
- Borg, M. "A New Context for Romans 13," *NTS* 19, 1972/3 205-18.

- Bruce, F.F. "Paul and 'The Powers That Be,'" *BJRL* 66, 1984, 78–96.
- Bultmann, R. "Glossen im Römerbrief," *TLZ* 72, 1947, 197–202.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to Romans* — Vol. II, 1979. Edinburgh. Clark.
- Cullmann, O. *The State in the New Testament*, 1956. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Daube, D. *Studies in Biblical Law*, 1947. Cambridge. University Press.
- Dibelius, O. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, 1909. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Foerster, W. *From the Exile to Christ*, 1964. Philadelphia. Fortress.
- Friedrich, J., et al. "Zur historischen Situation und Intention von Röm. 13, 1–7," *ZTK* 73, 1976, 131–66.
- Gaugusch, L. "Die Staatslehre des Paulus nach Röm. 13," *TGL* 26, 1934, 529–50.
- Hatch, E. and Radpath, H.A. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, 1954. Graz. Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt.
- Kallas, J. "Romans XIII:1–7. An Interpolation," *NTS* 11, 1964/5 365–74.
- Käsemann, E. "The Interpretation of Romans 13," in *New Testament Questions for Today*, 1959. Philadelphia. Fortress.
- Kuss, O. *Auslegung und Verkündigung—Aufsätze zur Exegese des Neuen Testaments*, 1963. Regensburg. Friedrich Pustet.
- Laub, F. "Der Christ und die staatliche Gewalt—Zum Verständnis der 'politischen' Paränese Röm. 13, 1–7," *MTZ* 30, 1979, 156–65.
- Leenhardt, F.J. *The Epistle to the Romans*, 1961. New York. World.
- Lohse, E. *Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*, 1971. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Michel, O. *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1955. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
 Mommsen, T. *Römisches Strafrecht*, 1899. Leipzig. Verlag von Duncker & Humboldt {143}
 Murray, J. *The Epistle to the Romans*, 1968. Grand Rapids. Eerdmans.
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. *St Paul's Corinth*, 1983. Wilmington. Michael Glazier.
 Pierce, C.A. *Conscience in the New Testament*, 1955. London. SCM.
- Schmoller, A. *Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*, 1982. Stuttgart. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Strobel, A. "Zum Verständnis von Röm. 13," *ZNW* 47, 1956, 67–93.
- van Unnik, W.C. "Lob und Strafe durch die Obrigkeit. Hellenistisches zu R6 m. 13, 3–4, in *Jesus und Paul. Festschrift für W.G. Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*.
 Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wilckens, U. *Rechtfertigung als Freiheit*, 1974. Neukirchen-Vluyn. Neukirchener. Zsifkovits, V. *Der Staatsgedanke nach Paulus in Röm. 13, 1–7*, 1964. Vienna. Herder.

3. EDUCATION AND CHANGE

REVOLUTION VIA EDUCATION

Samuel L. Blumenfeld

It is impossible to speak of the revolution that has taken place in American education since the 1930s without invoking the name of John Dewey. While it is true that many other important and influential personalities helped plan and carry out that revolution, their names are virtually unknown to the public. Who remembers James McKeen Cattell or Edward L. Thorndike or Charles H. Judd? But everyone remembers John Dewey, whose memory has been kept alive by an army of devoted disciples. Why? Because John Dewey is the Lenin of the American socialist revolution, worshipped by the Communist party of the Soviet Union. Stalin may be periodically denounced by Soviet leaders, but Lenin, who was every bit as evil, is held up as the paragon of revolutionary virtue.

There are interesting similarities between John Dewey and Lenin. Both men have been deified by their disciples. Neither man is ever blamed for the failures of the system he helped bring into existence.

And just as Lenin did not invent communism, John Dewey did not invent socialism. In fact, Dewey seldom used the word socialism. He preferred the word democracy, which he defined in his own special way.

And that is why it is so easy for Dewey's disciples to constantly refer back to their revolutionary mentor in the name of democracy.

After all, who can possibly be against democracy, particularly if your concept of it is somewhat vague and ambiguous? {146}

It was Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, who decided that Americans ought to become unconfused about democracy. He coined the slogan. "This is a republic, not a democracy. Let's keep it that way." This simple formulation has helped thousands of Americans to re-educate themselves. And

anyone who does this becomes astutely aware of how the enemy has used the distortions and confusion of language to gain his totalitarian ends. It was George Orwell who predicted how language would become so perverted by the collectivists that in time despotism would be called democracy, slavery freedom, and war peace.

Another great similarity between Dewey and Lenin is that both men were master strategists who studied closely the social systems they wanted to overthrow and came up with far-reaching plans whereby their respective revolutions could be carried out. Of course, Russia and the United States differed greatly as societies, and therefore the revolutionaries were faced with different realities. However, both Dewey and Lenin shared basic philosophical premises. They both rejected belief in God, both became materialists, both believed in evolution—that human beings were animals—and both believed in behavioral psychology as the means of studying human nature and controlling human behavior.

Both men belonged to the world socialist movement which by the late nineteenth century had diverged into two separate movements based on differing strategies. The Social Democrats chose to use the legislative, parliamentary means to achieve socialism, and the communists advocated violent overthrow of the existing capitalist system and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. Even though the French Revolution was held up by socialists as their model of revolution, it was the catastrophe of the Paris Commune of 1871, in which 20,000 people were killed by government troops in a week of street fighting, that convinced socialists in Western Europe to resort to the parliamentary method to achieve their ends. And probably the same would have been true in Eastern Europe had not World War I produced the conditions in which violent revolution could succeed. In the case of Russia, however, it should be remembered that the czar was deposed by a bloodless revolution led by the Social Democrat Alexander Kerensky. It was Lenin who then overthrew the weak provisional, but essentially democratic, government of Kerensky in October 1917 and established the Communist regime with its reign of terror.

In Great Britain, the socialist movement made little headway

until {147} the formation of the Fabian Society in 1884 by a small group of young intellectuals and professionals. With their religious beliefs virtually demolished by Darwinism and science, these young idealists needed some greater cause to live for, and many of them found it in socialism. The uniqueness of the Fabian Society was in its *modus operandi*. As Rose Martin writes. “The Fabian Society’s originality lies in the techniques it has developed for permeating established institutions and penetrating political parties in order to win command of the machinery of power. Historically speaking, perhaps its most remarkable feat has been to endow social revolution with an aura of lofty respectability.”¹

The Society had been named after the Roman general and dictator, Quintus Fabius Maximus, who became known as the Delayer, because of his delaying tactics used against Hannibal in the second Punic War during the third century BC. By avoiding all-out battles at a time when Rome was weak, Fabius won time to build up Rome’s military strength. When Rome was finally ready, Hannibal was decisively vanquished and Carthage destroyed.

And so the Fabians stressed the value of delayed action. Fabian Tract No., put it in these words. “For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did most patiently when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes, you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain and fruitless.”²

On the cover of many Fabian publications was the motto. “I wait long, but when I strike, I strike hard.” The tortoise became the heraldic device of the Society because it symbolized persistence, longevity, slow and guarded progress towards a revolutionary goal.

The three legendary leaders of the Fabian Society were Sidney and Beatrice Webb and George Bernard Shaw. Other important members were Theosophist Annie Besant, sexologist Havelock Ellis, Graham Wallas, who later taught at Harvard where he recruited Walter Lippmann to the cause, and H.G. Wells who eventually defected, calling the Fabians the New Machiavellians. Shaw is said to have confided to a German socialist friend that he

1. Rose L. Martin, *Fabian Freeway*, Western Islands, 1966, 12–13.

2. *Ibid.*, 14.

had wanted the Fabians to be “the Jesuits of socialism.”³

In 1910, when the Society was 25 years old, Shaw commissioned an artist to design and construct a stained-glass window for the Society’s headquarters. For thirty years, the window was privately displayed to the socialist inner circle, for in the middle of it was the Fabian coat-of-arms: a wolf in sheep’s clothing. It also depicted Sidney Webb and George Bernard Shaw as blacksmiths about to {148} smash the world with sledge-hammers, beneath the inscription, “Remould it nearer to the heart’s desire,” taken from a quatrain in Edward Fitzgerald’s translation of Omar Khayyam:

Dear Love, couldst thou and I with fate conspire
To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
Would we not shatter it to bits, and then
Remould it nearer to the heart’s desire!⁴

Today the window can be seen by visitors to the Beatrice Webb House in Surrey, England, a memorial financed by the world socialist movement. In 1887, the Fabian Society published its credo, to which every member was obliged to subscribe. It read:

The Fabian Society consists of Socialists....It aims at the reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit....The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land....The Society further works for the transfer to the Community of such Industrial Capital as can conveniently be handled socially. For the attainment of these ends the Fabian Society looks to the spread of Socialist opinions, and the social and political changes consequent thereon....⁵

The main strategy of the Society was to develop, through permeation of the educated class, a Socialist elite. Fabians insisted from the start that in advanced capitalist countries like England and the United States, Socialism must begin at the top and meet the working masses half way. Hence, great emphasis was put on the development of leadership, particularly among academics. In

3. *Ibid.*, 16.

4. Zygmund Dobbs, *The Great Deceit*, Veritas Foundation, 1964, viii; also Martin, *op.cit.*, 31.

5. Martin, *op.cit.*, 19.

1894, the Fabians established the London School of Economics and Political Science, which was to become the training ground for the Socialist elite.

The Fabian idea was not unique to Great Britain. In the United States a similar strategy was outlined in a book entitled *The Cooperative Commonwealth*, written by a socialist lawyer named Laurence Gronlund and published in 1884, the very year the Fabian Society was founded. Gronlund, a Danish immigrant who was educated in Europe, had come to the conclusion that neither European methods nor an alien terminology could ever succeed in making Socialism acceptable to most Americans. Social revolution {149} had to be disguised, he said. It had to be a gradualist movement for social reform. To the average American of the 1880s, the word Socialism was synonymous with atheism, revolution, and free love.

But among the academic elite, where sympathy for socialism was far greater than among the common folk, it was a different story. Among those sympathetic to Socialism was Professor Richard T. Ely of Johns Hopkins University. It was Ely who organized the American Economic Association in 1885, recruiting a host of other professors, who then made the association into a vehicle for promoting Socialism. Present at the founders' meeting was Thomas Davidson, an itinerant scholar, who had helped found the Fabian Society in London during the previous year.⁶

In 1888, there appeared a book that was to give a tremendous boost to the Socialist movement in America. It was a utopian fantasy written by a journalist, Edward Bellamy, and entitled *Looking Backward*. It became a best seller and one of the most influential books of its time. It is the story of Julian West, a Bostonian who falls asleep in 1887 and wakes up in the year 2000 to find that a bloodless socialist revolution has taken place in America and that now the government owns everything through nationalization. The entire economy is organized around an Industrial Army, in which every citizen must serve from the age of 21 to 45. Everyone is paid equally, but not in money, for money has been abolished. "A credit corresponding to his share of the annual product of the nation is given to every citizen on

6. *Ibid.*, 123.

the public books at the beginning of each year, and a credit card is issued him with which he procures at the public storehouses whatever he desires." No buying or selling among private citizens is permitted, for "buying and selling is essentially anti-social in all its tendencies."⁷

And, of course, in Bellamy's utopia, evil and crime have virtually disappeared. Bellamy writes. "The ten commandments became well-nigh obsolete in a world where there was no temptation to theft, no occasion to lie either for fear or favor, no room for envy where all were equal, and little provocation to violence where men were disarmed of power to injure one another. Humanity's ancient dream of liberty, equality, fraternity...at last was realized....It was for the first time possible to see what unperverted human nature really was like....Soon was fully realized, what the divines and philosophers of old would never have believed, that human nature in its essential qualities is good, not bad, that men by their natural intention and structure are generous, not selfish, pitiful, not cruel, sympathetic, not arrogant, godlike in aspirations, instinct with divinest impulses of {150} tenderness and self-sacrifice, images of God indeed, not the travesties upon Him they had seemed."⁸ Paradise indeed had been achieved!

As ridiculous as all of this sounds today, Bellamy not only believed in what he wrote but considered it to be "a forecast, in accordance with the principles of evolution, of the next stage in the industrial and social development of humanity, especially in this country."⁹

And countless Americans shared his belief. So great was their enthusiasm that they organized the Nationalist Club—nationalist standing for nationalization—a kind of American Fabian Society dedicated to promoting the principle of the "Brotherhood of Man" and the nationalization of private industry. Their credo stated:

Those who seek the welfare of man must endeavor to suppress the system founded on brute principles of competition and put in its place another based on the nobler principles of association....

7. Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward*, Boston, 1887; Modern Library Edition, 1951, 68–69.

8. *Ibid.*, 234–35.

9. *Ibid.*, 273.

We advocate no sudden or ill-considered changes; we make no war upon individuals who have accumulated immense fortunes simply by carrying to a logical end the false principles upon which business is now based.

The combinations, trusts and syndicates of which the people at present complain demonstrate the practicability of our basic principle of association. We merely seek to push this principle a little further and have all industries operated in the interests of the nation—the people organized—the organic unity of the whole people.¹⁰

The aim of the Nationalist Club was to “educate” the American people through lectures, books and publications in the general principles of economic reform advocated by Bellamy, which would eventually lead to the establishment of the cooperative commonwealth.

The movement grew rapidly and by 189, there were 165 Nationalist clubs throughout the country. Particularly drawn to the movement were the followers of Theosophist occultists Annie Besant and Helena Blavatsky. Of *Looking Backward*, Blavatsky wrote in 1889 that it “admirably represents the Theosophical idea of what should be the first great step towards the full realization of universal brotherhood.”¹¹

However, by 1893 most of the Nationalist clubs had disappeared, with their hard-core socialist members becoming active in any number of educational enterprises. One of these enterprises was a {151} new monthly journal which made its appearance in 1895, *The American Fabian*, published by the Fabian Educational Company of Boston. The editors wrote.

We call our paper “The American Fabian” because our politics must in a measure differ from those of the English Fabians... England’s (unwritten) Constitution readily admits of constant though gradual modification. Our American Constitution does not readily admit of such change. England can thus move into Socialism almost imperceptibly. Our Constitution being largely individualistic must be changed to admit of Socialism, and each

10. Martin, *op.cit.*, 127.

11. Sylvia E. Bowman, *Edward Bellamy Abroad*, New York, 1962, 385.

change necessitates a political crisis.”¹²

Thus by the 1890s, it had become apparent to American socialists that the United States Constitution represented a formidable obstacle to the creation of a socialist America.

In April 1898, Sidney and Beatrice Webb arrived in the United States where they were wined and dined by the socialist elite. In Chicago, the Webbs stayed at Hull House as guests of its legendary founder Jane Addams, pioneer in the settlement house movement.¹³

It was probably at this time that John Dewey, then professor at the University of Chicago, met the Webbs. Dewey had close relations with Hull House, founded in 1889 by Addams. He was on its first board of trustees and even conducted courses there. According to biographer George Dykhuizen, “Dewey owed much to the influences he encountered at Hull House. His contact with people with more radical and extreme views than his deepened and sharpened his own.”¹⁴

Eventually, Dewey was to become America’s leading strategist for Socialism, and it is obvious that he took his cue from the Fabians. How did Dewey become a Socialist? The story is interesting.

John Dewey was born in Vermont in 1859 and was raised in a Christian family of Puritan heritage. He attended a liberal-leaning Congregational Church and taught Sunday school. In 1875, he entered the University of Vermont. Max Eastman writes of a crisis in Dewey’s junior year that marked a turning point in the young man’s life.

The crisis was a short course in physiology with a textbook written by Thomas Henry Huxley. That accidental contact with Darwin’s brilliant disciple, then waging his fierce war for evolution against the “impregnable rock” of Holy Scripture, {152} woke John Dewey up to the spectacular excitement of the effort to understand the world....He was swept off his feet by the rapture of scientific knowledge.¹⁵

12. Martin, *op.cit.*, 136.

13. *Ibid.*, 140.

14. George Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey*, Southern Illinois University Press, 1973, 105.

15. Max Eastman, *Great Companions*, Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1942, 255.

In 1881, Dewey began studies for his doctorate at Johns Hopkins University. There, encouraged by George Sylvester Morris, his professor, he became a Hegelian. The powerful attraction of Hegel's philosophy was that it permitted an individual to embrace science and evolution, discard the notion of sin, but still retain some notion of God. Eastman writes:

Hegel invented a most ingenious disguise, a truly wondrous scheme for keeping deity in the world....His scheme was, in brief, to say that all reality, good and bad together, *is* the Divine Spirit in a process of inward, and also onward and upward, struggle toward the realization of its own free and complete being. Many years before natural science began to see the world as in process of evolution, Hegel was ready for them with his theory that God himself *is* a world in process of evolution. Nothing more prodigiously ingenious was ever invented by the mind of man than this Hegelian scheme for defending soulfulness against science.¹⁶

It was also at Johns Hopkins that Dewey was introduced to the New Psychology by G. Stanley Hall, who had studied in Leipzig under Wilhelm Wundt. Dewey took all of Hall's courses in experimental and physiological psychology.

In 1884, Dewey was brought to the University of Michigan as instructor in philosophy by Professor Morris, who was then head of the department. The two men, steeped in Hegelianism, enjoyed a rich personal and intellectual friendship. It was also at Michigan that Dewey met Alice Chapman, a strong-minded young lady from a family of radicals and freethinkers. Dewey fell in love, and they married in 1886. Dewey later told a friend, "No two people were ever more in love."¹⁷

In 1887, Dewey published his textbook, *Psychology*, which was his fullest and most successful articulation of his Hegelian approach blended with the new experimental psychology. In 1888, Dewey went to the University of Minnesota as head of the philosophy department. Most probably, Dewey read *Looking Backward* in that year, because it was then that he also wrote his essay, "The Ethics of Democracy," in which he formulated a new collectivist concept for American democracy. He rejected the notions that America

16. *Ibid.*, 260.

17. *Ibid.*, 265.

was {153} made up of individuals who expressed their political will through a constitutionally established elective and legislative process. He claimed that such a notion inferred that men “in their natural state are non-social units...a mere multitude.” On the contrary, he argued, society is organic and “the citizen is a member of the organism, and, just in proportion to the perception of the organism, has concentrated within himself its intelligence and will.”¹⁸

This was simply another way of phrasing Bellamy’s concept of the nation, as described in *Looking Backward*, “not as an association of men for certain political functions affecting their happiness only remotely and superficially, but as a family, a vital union, a common life, a mighty heaven-touching tree, whose leaves are its people, fed from its veins, and feeding it in turn.”¹⁹

Dewey, in his essay, expanded on this organic concept:

But human society represents a more perfect organism. The whole lives truly in every member, and there is no longer the appearance of physical aggregation, or continuity. The organism manifests itself as what it truly is, an ideal or spiritual life, a unity of will ... In conception, at least, democracy approaches most nearly the ideal of all social organizations. that in which the individual and society are organic to each other.

And how did this organic and rather Platonic-Hegelian view of society affect individual liberty? Dewey wrote:

Nothing could be more aside from the mark than to say that the Platonic ideal subordinates and sacrifices the individual to the state. It does, indeed, hold that the individual can be what he ought to be, can become what, in idea, he is, only as a member of a spiritual organism, called by Plato the state, and, in losing his own individual will, acquiring that of this larger reality. But this is not loss of selfhood or personality, it is its realization. The individual is not sacrificed; he is brought to reality in the state.

Now you see it, now you don’t. Dewey was quite adept at this sort of intellectual shell-game. He argued quite passionately that we had to stop looking at the individual in isolation.

18. John Dewey, “The Ethics of Democracy,” in *The Early Works of John Dewey*, Southern Illinois University Press, 1969, Vol. 1, 231, 235.

19. Bellamy, *op.cit.*, 207.

Liberty is not a numerical notion of isolation; it is the ethical idea that personality is the supreme and only law, that every {154} man is an absolute end in himself....but the chief stimuli and encouragements to the realization of personality come from society.... Equality is not an arithmetical but an ethical conception....Equality, in short, is the ideal of humanity; an ideal in the consciousness of which democracy lives and moves....And there is no need to beat about the bush in saying that democracy is not in reality what it is in name until it is industrial, as well as civil and political.

And finally, Dewey wrapped it up with. "The idea of democracy, the ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity, represent a society in which the distinction between the spiritual and secular has ceased, ...the divine and the human organization of society are one."

These are the terms in which Dewey was to argue in the years ahead, that in the democratic state, God and man were one, a blend of Hegelian idealism, utopian fantasy, and Platonic logic. It was about as far as one could go from the ideology of the Founding Fathers without becoming a Marxist revolutionary or, in later years, a terrorist for Lenin.

Dewey's rejection of eighteenth-century individualistic liberalism, with its notion of unalienable rights, was complete and irrevocable, and in time he was to remove God from his political equation, substituting Humanism for religion. But his admiration for Edward Bellamy never waned. In 1934, in a tribute to Bellamy entitled "The Great American Prophet," he wrote that Bellamy was "imbued with a religious faith in the democratic ideal....But what distinguishes Bellamy is that he grasped the *human* meaning of democracy as an idea of equality and liberty. No one has carried through the idea that equality is obtainable only by complete equality of income more fully than Bellamy."²⁰

In 1889, the untimely death of George Morris created a crisis at Michigan and Dewey was brought back to head the philosophy department. He remained at Michigan until 1894. During his time there, he was a member of the Congregational Church at Ann Arbor. Dykhuizen writes.

Because the Hegelianism of Morris and Dewey had a place for traditional Christian concepts, the extension of its point of view

20. Bowman, *op.cit.*, 40.

to the several courses in philosophy and psychology gave the department a distinctly religious atmosphere that satisfied all but the most orthodox that the religious faith of the students was safe under Morris and Dewey as it had been under clergymen.¹ {155}

In 1894, Dewey left Michigan and joined the faculty at the University of Chicago as chairman of the Department of Philosophy, Psychology, and Pedagogy. The new university, only four years old and endowed by John D. Rockefeller, was directed by President William Rainey Harper, a theological liberal. By then Dewey had come to the conclusion that the only road to Socialism in America was the long persevering one of education. That his aim was radical reform was made quite clear in an essay, written in 1894, entitled "Reconstruction":

[T]he radical, the one who is for progress, cannot gain his end if he shuts himself off from established facts of life. If he turn to the future before he has taken home to himself the meaning of the past, his efforts will in so far be futile....It is folly, it is worse than folly, it is mere individual conceit, for one to set out to reform the world, either at large or in detail, until he has learned what the existing world which he wishes to reform has for him to learn....The most progressive force in life is the idea of the past set free from its local and partial bonds and moving on to the fuller expression of its own destiny.²

While the use of the word "destiny" gives evidence that Dewey was still strongly under the influence of Hegelian idealism, his views had undergone significant changes during the last years at Michigan. In fact, his formal connection with organized religion ended when he left Ann Arbor. A few years after settling in Chicago, he withdrew his membership from the church in Ann Arbor and did not ask for a letter of transferral to a church in Chicago. He had by then become a pragmatic materialist, having shed the Hegelian concept of the Absolute and adopted a more comfortable concept of moral relativism.

It was now as chairman of the Department of Pedagogy that Dewey began to concentrate his efforts on education. Dewey

1. Dykhuizen, *op.cit.*, 47.

2. John Dewey, "Reconstruction," in *The Early Works of John Dewey*, Southern Illinois University Press, 1971, Vol. 4, 104.

realized that if the scenario in Bellamy's *Looking Backward* were ever to be realized, it would have to be done by preparing the young not only to accept a socialist way of life but to want to bring it about. The situation at Chicago afforded Dewey the opportunity to put his educational ideas into practice by creating an experimental school. The school would serve as a laboratory for psychology and pedagogy in the same manner that labs were used for experiments in the physical sciences. In fact, it came to be known as the Laboratory {156} School.

The purpose of the school was to find out what kind of curriculum was needed to create that social individual who would fit easily into a socialist society. The question for the radical educator was how to socialize children so that they became the kind of selfless egalitarians who would serve the organic state as willingly and uncomplainingly as the citizens of Bellamy's utopia and would work assiduously to create such a utopia.

Dewey decided that the best way to achieve this new collectivist personality was to turn the classroom into a place where these desirable social traits could be developed. He wrote.

Since the integration of the individual and the social is impossible except when the individual lives in close association with others in the constant free give and take of experiences, it seemed that education could prepare the young for the future social life only when the school was itself a cooperative society on a small scale.”³

What kind of curriculum would fit a school that was a mini-cooperative society? Dewey's recommendation was indeed radical. build a curriculum not around academic subjects but occupational activities which provided maximum opportunities for socialization. Since the beginning of Western civilization, the school curriculum centered around the development of academic skills, the intellectual faculties, high literacy. Now Dewey wanted to change all of that. Why? Because high literacy produced that abominable form of individualism which was basically, as Dewey believed, anti-social. Thus, from Dewey's point of view, the school's primary commitment to literacy was indeed the key to the whole problem. In 1898, he wrote an essay, “The Primary. Education

3. K.C. Mayhew and A.C. Edwards, *The Dewey School*, Atherton Press, 1966, 5.

Fetich,⁴ in which he explained exactly what he meant.

There is...a false educational god whose idolaters are legion, and whose cult influences the entire educational system. This is language study—the study not of foreign language, but of English; not in higher, but in primary education. It is almost an unquestioned assumption, of educational theory and practice both, that the first three years of a child's school life shall be mainly taken up with learning to read and write his own language. If we add to this the learning of a certain amount of numerical combinations, we have the pivot about which primary education swings.... {157}

It does not follow however, that because this course was once wise it is so any longer...The present has its claims. It is in education, if anywhere, that the claims of the present should be controlling.... My proposition is, that conditions—social, industrial, and intellectual—have undergone such a radical change, that the time has come for a thoroughgoing examination of the emphasis put upon linguistic work in elementary instruction....

The plea for the predominance of learning to read in early school life because of the great importance attaching to literature seems to me a perversion.

Dewey then argued how important it was for the child to experience life through classroom activities, projects and social interaction before learning to read about them. And the reading materials themselves had to be relevant to the child's needs. He wrote:

Every respectable authority insists that the period of childhood, lying between the years of four and eight or nine, is the plastic period in sense and emotional life. What are we doing to shape these capacities? What are we doing to feed this hunger? If one compared the powers and needs of the child in these directions with what is actually supplied in the regimen of the three R's, the contrast is pitiful and tragic...No one can clearly set before himself the vivacity and persistency of the child's motor instincts at this period, and then call to mind the continued grind of reading and writing, without feeling that the justification of our present curriculum is psychologically impossible. It is simply superstition.

4. John Dewey, "The Primary-Education Fetich," in *The Early Works of John Dewey*, Southern Illinois University Press, 1972, Vol. 5, 254–269.

it is a remnant of an outgrown period of history.

Finally, Dewey, the master strategist, set forth what must be done:

Change must come gradually. To force it unduly would compromise its final success by favoring a violent reaction. What is needed in the first place, is that there should be a full and frank statement of conviction with regard to the matter from physiologists and psychologists and from those school administrators who are conscious of the evils of the present regime....Wherever movements looking to a solution of the problem are intelligently undertaken, they should receive encouragement, moral and financial, from the intellectual leaders of the community. There are already in existence a {158} considerable number of educational "experiment stations," which represent the outposts of educational progress. If these schools can be adequately supported for a number of years they will perform a great vicarious service. After such schools have worked out carefully and definitely the subject-matter of a new curriculum, —finding the right place for language-studies and placing them in their right perspective, —the problem of the more general educational reform will be immensely simplified and facilitated.

Here was, indeed, a master plan, involving the entire progressive educational community, to create a new socialist curriculum for the schools of America, a plan that was indeed carried out and implemented. However, it was in Dewey's famous statement of belief, "My Pedagogic Creed,"⁵ written in 1897, that he spelled out quite clearly that the school was to be the vehicle of America's socialist revolution. Again he put forth his collectivist concepts of an organic society, the social individual, the downgrading of academics, and the need to use psychology in education. He wrote.

I believe that all education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race....He becomes an inheritor of the funded capital of civilization....

...Without insight into the psychological structure and activities of the individual, the education process will...be haphazard and arbitrary....

5. John Dewey, "My Pedagogic Creed," in *The Early Works of John Dewey*, Southern Illinois University Press, 1972, Vol 5, 84–95.

In sum, I believe that the individual who is to be educated is a social individual and that society is an organic union of individuals.

I believe that the school is primarily a social institution. Education being a social process, the school is simply a form of community life in which all those agencies are concentrated that will be most effective in bringing the child to share in the inherited resources of the race, and to use his own powers for social ends.

I believe that education, therefore, is a process of living and not a preparation for future living.

...It is true that language is a logical instrument, but it is fundamentally and primarily a social instrument....

I believe that the image is the great instrument of instruction....

I believe that much of the time and attention now given to the preparation and presentation of lessons might be more wisely and profitably expended in training the child's power {159} of imagery and in seeing to it that he was continually forming definite, vivid, and growing images of the various subjects with which he comes in contact in his experience....

I believe that education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform.

I believe that all reforms which rest simply upon the enactment of law, or the threatening of certain penalties, or upon changes in mechanical or outward arrangements, are transitory and futile.

I believe that education is the regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness; and that adjustment of individual activity on the basis of this social consciousness is the only sure method of social reconstruction....

I believe it is the business of every one interested in education to insist upon the school as the primary and most effective interest of social progress and reform in order that society may be awakened to realize what the school stands for, and aroused to the necessity of endowing the educator with sufficient equipment properly to perform his task....

I believe that with the growth of psychological science, ...and with the growth of social science...all scientific resources can be utilized

for the purposes of education....

I believe that every teacher...is a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth.

I believe that in this way the teacher always is the prophet of the true God and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God.

You couldn't get more messianic than that! It was the intensity of Dewey's ideological commitment that made him the philosophical leader of the American socialist revolution. He formulated its basic strategy of revolution via education.

More than ninety years have gone by since Dewey set American education on its progressive course. The result is an education system in shambles, a rising national tide of illiteracy and the social misery caused in its wake. Bellamy's vision of a socialist utopia in the year 2000 is even more remote today than it was in 1988. In England, the Fabian tortoise has been quashed by Margaret Thatcher, and in America, orthodox religion, once considered quite extinct, is growing in strength and influence creating waves of pessimism among secular humanists. The worldwide disillusionment with socialism is so great that the Communists must use terror and deception to capture {160} the unwary. And in the Communist world, socialism can be seen for what it really is, a Satanic conspiracy to destroy mankind.

In 1899, Dewey published *School and Society*, his blueprint for socialism via education. It clearly established him as the leader of progressive education. In 1904, he left Chicago and joined the faculty at Columbia University and Teachers College in New York. There he grew in stature as the moral interpreter of American progressivism. And the reason why Dewey comes across as so distinctly American is because he took his socialist vision from Bellamy, not Marx. And yet, the society in the world today that comes closest to Bellamy's vision is the Soviet Union! Meanwhile, we in the United States must live with the disastrous consequences of the Dewey-inspired curriculum.

WHAT IS EDUCATION?

Otto Scott

This essay was adopted from an address given at the annual meeting of the Alaska Private and Home Educators Association in Anchorage in October 1988.

A couple of years ago, two books on education became unexpected best-sellers. One is *The Closing of the American Mind*, by Allan Bloom, and the other is *Cultural Literacy*, by E. D. Hirsch.

They are both worth reading, especially by educators and serious students. Both were written by university professors. Both complain about the lack of a proper educational background on the part of their students, and the deficiencies of modern universities.

In both instances, the professors are non-Christian. That is not to say that their opinions are without value or interest to us. But it is to say that their ideas about culture do not include the history of Christianity, the role of Christians in the world or in this nation, nor the idea of a Christian civilization.

They talk about great books and men of learning without particular reference to Christianity, as though the peaks of this civilization were achieved without Christian foundations. Therefore, both Bloom and Hirsch talk about values as though they are inherent, automatic, in the air.

They also talk about education as though it were automatically linked to character and a sense of justice. That is a cultural assumption, and a very old one. It stems from the persuasions of Plato and his famous argument with Thrasymachus in the 5th century BC

It was Plato's argument that educated men would learn, from their schooling, the miseries that arise from vice. Thrasymachus argued, on the other hand, that the world is riddled with vice and corruption, and pointed to the numerous examples

of vice rewarded on earth. Plato persisted, however, in saying that education is a search for excellence, and that persons so engaged would naturally want the most excellent society. Therefore, the best educated would be the best people, and therefore all society should be ruled by the best educated. We can all understand why schoolmen through the ages consider Plato so wonderful. But we can look around us, as did Thrasymachus, and see a dismal world. However, Thrasymachus and his cynical views have been regarded by 2,500 years of scholars as the loser in the debate. In terms of words, Plato won. His logic appeared rational, hopeful and idealistic, all at the same time.

Thrasymachus, on the other hand, portrayed a world of depraved people. Judges willing to accept bribes to render false judgments. Politicians whose promises were written on water. Businessmen who connived to cheat in the marketplace. Criminals capable of any atrocity. Those arguments were distinctly unpopular, and Thrasymachus found it impossible to earn a living as a teacher in Athens. He eventually committed suicide. But Plato was a great favorite. He could socialize on all levels, and charmed all his listeners. He was a great favorite of even Dyonisius, the tyrant of Sicily, who ruled with extraordinary cruelty. Plato, with remarkable flexibility, was able to get along with such a monster, just as so many of our college professors regarded Stalin with admiration, and Gorbachev with near-adoration. In terms of life, in terms of history, in terms of the slave society of 5th century Athens, Thrasymachus won the debate, but the audience applauded Plato, and Plato collected the prize.

Plato retired to the Grove of Academus and lived to a ripe old age, laden with honors. But not long after that, the Athenians realized that the Sophists—their name for humanists like Plato—had virtually destroyed the faith of the Greek people in their ancient religion. Ritual had degenerated into orgies. the gods were considered myths for children, virility softened into homosexuality, and lesbianism became fashionable among women. With vice rampant and corruption widespread, the Greeks lost their fabled fighting ability, for nothing they had or knew was worth fighting to defend. They stoned the Sophists to death. And no university professor that I know, or expect to know, is likely to write a book about why they did so.

Yet any Christian scholar can do so. For when a people lose their faith their society loses coherence; it no longer functions according {163} to a fixed standard of right and wrong, good and evil. Schools are reduced to teaching tricks and skills, which we call processes and techniques. The Greeks and the Romans called them courses in rhetoric, strategy and tactics. These are courses in how to succeed in the world. As we know, that sort of education did not save the ancient civilizations. They fell from worshipping their gods to worshipping Power and Chance. The god *Fortunatus* collected many devotees, who paid large sums to have their horoscopes cast, and consulted with magicians for spells, poisons, cures and amulets. Superstition replaced the sense of the transcendent.

Christians altered that. I do not need to explain what Christianity meant to the ancient world, nor shall I dwell on the three centuries of persecution and martyrdom—three centuries!—endured by the early Christians. Let it suffice to say that until Constantine the Great converted, Christians seemed doomed to extinction by all the rules of the world. by all the measures of success. And although it is unfashionable to say so now, the fact remains that it was not until the church and the state were put together by Constantine that Christians began to spread from the catacombs and the secret rooms into the open streets and landscapes of Europe.

Putting that larger scene to one side, let's look at the course of education. There was a period when the ancient schools and methods functioned together with Christianity. St. Augustine, for instance, was a product of Roman education, though his mother was a Christian and he was raised as a member of the church. He studied rhetoric, which might be equated with law today, or politics. And he rose in the Roman system to high office in Milan. Then he converted, and he wrote about that conversion in his *Confessions*. Later he rejoined the church, became bishop of Hippo, and thereafter his life, and his writings fall into the category of adult education. Just before his death, St. Augustine saw the fall of Rome and in common with his generation, thought that if it was not the end of the world, it was at least a sign that the end was near. If we see the fall of the West—and we may—there will be many among us who will feel the same way.

But Rome did not collapse into a heap all at once. vestiges of

the Roman civilization lingered in a sort of fading twilight, for centuries. The rays of a new civilization came slowly; the transition in many ways has never been completely made. The writings of Plato and the presumed science of Aristotle, the medical theories of Galen and Hippocrates. the *ideas* of Greece and Rome linger to this day. We owe to ancient civilizations the idea that there should be no limits to {164} the authority of the state. In the days of Greece and Rome, the citizen was as much in the hands of the community as the slave was in the hand of his master.

Lord Acton said,

The most sacred obligations vanished before the public advantage. The passengers existed for the sake of the ship. By their disregard for private interests, and for the moral welfare and improvement of the people, both Greece and Rome destroyed the vital elements on which the prosperity of the nation rests, and perished by the decay of families and the depopulation of the country.

Then he added an essential observation:

They survive not in their institutions but in their ideas, especially on the art of government. They are.

The dead, but sceptered sovereigns
 who still rule
 Our spirits from their urns.

To them, indeed, can be traced nearly all the errors that are undermining political society—Communism...the confusion between tyranny and authority and between lawlessness and freedom.

The idea that men lived originally in a state of nature, by violence and without laws, is due to Critias. Communism in its grossest form was recommended by Diogenes According to the Sophists, there is no duty above expediency and no virtue apart from pleasure. Laws are an invention of weak men to rob their betters of the reasonable employment of their superiority. It is better to inflict than to suffer wrong Happiness consists of obtaining power and eluding the necessity of obedience....

Epicurus differs little from the proponents of revolutionary despotism. All societies, he said, are founded on contract for mutual protections. Good and evil are conventional terms, for the

thunderbolts of heaven fall alike upon the just and the unjust.... Aristotle said that the mark of the worst governments is that they leave men free to live as they please.

...Socrates...knew of no higher criterion of behavior for men, of no better guide of conduct, than the law of each country. Plato... employed his intellect to advocate the abolition of the family and the exposure of infants....Aristotle saw no harm in slavery. {165}

These were the arguments that Christianity reduced to rubble, but they remain floating among us today, not only in the USSR, which has enslaved its neighbors as well as its own people, but in our midst—and especially in our universities and among our educated class.

The great error made by Greece and Rome was to believe that man's reason alone can maintain a society. Christianity introduced transcendent values into a society crumbling under such illusions, and transformed it in stages. But we should not forget the slowness of that transformation, nor the fact that it was never complete.

Unfortunately for both us and our children, we are vague about the civilization of the Middle Ages, which succeeded Rome. Few seem to know how Christians tamed the forests and reduced the wild animals and converted the pagan, cannibal tribes of Europe in the years between AD 400 and the eleventh century. This fascinating story has been neglected by its heirs—Catholic and Protestant alike. It is not until the beginning of the Renaissance that we find historians truly interested, although by then the Ages of Faith had created soaring cathedrals, hospitals and universities, cities and commerce, local and national governments and languages, riches and living standards higher and more variegated than any civilization ever conceived in the ancient world at anytime, anywhere, by any people.

To ignore this period, which Acton called the second civilization, is to attempt to erase a thousand years of Christendom as though it were unimportant. But this civilization was the seedbed of our science, our social structure, and of the ideas and individual values unknown to the ancients but inherent in Christianity.

Historians dote upon describing the educations of the nobility in the Middle Ages in terms of warrior knights and castle life. But the real schools were those created by the church, which

taught the clerks in monasteries and cities, courts of law and courts of nobles, how to read and write, how to keep records and translate documents that both preserved the past and recorded the present. These church schools led to the rise of universities and international scholarship. For long centuries, the cities were centers of ecclesiastical and commercial learning, hubs of commerce and theology, law and order—while the nobles and the monarchs lived on their huge country estates, surrounded by their individual hangers-on and courtiers.

In time, the raising tide of unprecedented prosperity undermined the Ages of Faith. the cities were altered by the pursuit of money and power when the kings and the nobles arrived with urban residences; {166} the wonders of the world began to crowd into the imaginations of men, and the late Middle Ages witnessed a wide scale decline in faith. By the time Dante was born in the thirteenth century, Christianity was in trouble.

The church grew corrupt. The forms of worship were preserved, and millions believed, but the ruling class had turned to the oldest of all the pagan gods. the gods of Power, Money and War. Tyrants arose to destroy the liberties of the Middle Ages, when elections were universal and no taxes were lawful that were not approved by those who paid them. The Middle Ages were a period when centralized authority was resisted by powerful classes, or groups—and men acknowledged duties higher than those imposed by man.

Then came the Renaissance, which is a word that means revival. In this instance, it referred to the revival of paganism. It began in Italy, at about the same time that despots arose in the independent city-states to strip the people of their liberties while beguiling them with entertainments. with music and painting and fashionable clothes, with poetry contests and prizes for literature and public speaking, with lectures and larger schools and palaces and princes of great learning and often superior abilities who had absolutely no conscience or morals whatever.

Overall, the Renaissance was the period when the literature and philosophy, art and immorality of the ancients was revived. People dug in their garden in the hope of excavating ancient statuary; the custom of awarding laurel wreaths revived; altogether the learning of the pagans bedazzled the Italians first, and all Europe afterward.

R. J. Rushdoony said that when he began to study the so-called

classic period, he felt as though he had been plunged into a sewer. To some extent, I think that was part of its allure. Paganism ignored the strictures and constraints of Christianity, described unbridled sex, portrayed pornography, indulged in uninhibited descriptions of emperors after they were safely dead, held aloft political murderers and tyrants as objects of envy. Above all, the Renaissance preached the doctrine of worldly pleasures and gains, of a universe controlled—or at least inhabited—by Man alone; Man without God.

One result was educational. To a considerable extent, education had, through all these centuries since Rome, maintained many of its ancient patterns. But the Renaissance ushered in a remarkable enthusiasm, amounting to reverence, for Latin and Greek—and all the relics of those civilizations. The styles of Cicero and Seneca were sedulously imitated; the thousand years between St. Augustine's studies of these authors were ignored as though they had not been lived. {167}

This meant not only a return to ancient ideas, but also to ancient forms. The science of the pagans had been mainly in astronomy and measurement. Hence, the limited geometry of Euclid was taught as though every child was intended to become a builder. Rhetoric—another term for what we today call “communications”—became fashionable again. Dress and manners for all were introduced after a long period when such matters were reserved for the court. Beyond all else, however, was the spread of Latin and Greek as two languages that all educated persons were expected to master.

Theology, once described as the Queen of the Sciences, gave way to pagan philosophy. Latin schools separated the children of the well-to-do from the common people, whose children attended church schools and were taught in the vernacular of their city, or region, or nation.

Scholars corresponded in Latin; books were copied in Latin; the men of learning were called Humanists. They haunted the courts of the tyrants much like Plato in Sicily. And Plato's idea that the elite were to enjoy privileges denied the common people began to be put into practice.

All this took place over a long stretch from the early thirteenth century to the early 16th. Christianity was dying at the core, in Rome, while the periphery, as Toynbee noted, was still dynamic.

European merchants and priests were carrying goods and Christianity to Mexico, Asia and Africa while popes paraded their mistresses and tyrants ordered political murders.

Education at such a time became divorced from values, separated from morality, earth-bound, mired in eloquent expediency. The idea of Plato that only the schooled should rule was combined with the idea of Thrasymachus that the world is corrupt. Modern historians hold aloft the vision of the Renaissance as a time of intellectual escape from the “superstitions” as they term it, of the Ages of Faith. But this is a scholarly lie.

The fact is that the Renaissance revived all the superstitions of the pagans, practices the church fathers condemned and tried to uproot. A belief that the world was created from chaos, and that chance—and the stars—rule everything and everyone. Astrology, that ancient fallacy, became popular once again and even the popes had their astrologers. These frauds cast their horoscopes on the basis of planetary positions once charted by the Egyptians and Babylonians, while staring at heavens that held changes the Egyptians and Babylonians never saw. {168} All this led to a spectacular decline in morality. When governments indulge in crimes, so do the people. Buckhardt, the greatest of Renaissance historians, said, “In the end, all sense of honor was lost, except vengeance.”

So steep was the decline that sixty years passed after the invention of printing and thirty thousand books issued from European presses before anyone undertook to print the Greek Testament. The principles of Machiavelli triumphed; the idea that ends of the state justify the means became embedded in the minds of the ruling classes.

But printing did, finally, launch the Reformation. Luther became the most popular author in Europe, and lit a volcano that still sends sparks. The explosion in the period from 1517 to 1600 was so huge, its effects were so widespread, that no summary is possible. It is generally described as a religious revolution, a revolution that launched religious wars.

Once again, the conventional explanation is in error. Certainly it started as a religious revolution, a rebellion against the monopoly of the theology maintained by the Vatican. But the governments of the period, anxious to centralize their power and shake off the

church, took ultimate control of the revolution. These governments in Germany, in Spain, in England, in France and elsewhere, became mini-Vaticans and their wars of power became entangled in religious as well as political issues. All the wars of the period involved national policy as much as religion. The revolution of the Reformation had the effect of blending church and state deeply in Germany under Lutheranism, less deeply but as definitely elsewhere. As Lord Acton pointed out, "It is interesting to note that Scotland was the only kingdom in which the Reformation triumphed over the resistance of the state, and Ireland the only instance where it failed, in spite of government support."

But the Reformers' revival of basic Christian principles is the most important result of the period. Calvin resumed where St. Augustine had left off. And it was from St. Paul through Augustine through Calvin that the early tenets of the church were rescued from the smothering centuries of Vatican pragmatics.

The effect on education was immediate. The Bible became, as it was intended, the great Book of God, from which men could discern the eternal values by which the course of their lives could be set and followed. But we should remember that it was a period when church and state were blended, and although men of religious faith sought to use the power of the state against one another, the state remained {169} dominant. When Lord Acton said, "Calvin preached and Bellarmine lectured, but Machiavelli reigned," he referred to *realpolitik*.

It was accepted by all men at that period that it was right to murder tyrants. That was taught by John of Salisbury in the twelfth century and confirmed by Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth. But resistance to tyranny did not mean that the resisters were automatically capable of creating a better government. The mystique of monarchy remained strong.

It was strong enough for kings to command their subjects to obey one faith or another, as in France and Germany, Spain and Britain. Madrid created the Inquisition to enforce that decree; the French conducted the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre. In England, under two kings and two queens, the nation passed four times in one generation from one faith to another. From Catholic to Protestant to Catholic, and finally from Catholicism back to Protestantism. It was being forced back to Arminianism, which

is a form of clericalism, of the doctrine that man can be an equal partner in his own salvation, when the Puritans rebelled.

These were men of strong convictions, men capable of putting their lives behind their principles. Of this sort, James Anthony Froude, an English historian of the nineteenth century, said:

Government by suffrage is only possible in periods when the convictions of men have ceased to be vital to them. As long as there is a minority that would rather die than continue in a lie, there is a further court of appeal from which there is no reference. When ten men are so earnest on one side that they will sooner be killed than give away, and twenty men are earnest enough on the other side to cast their votes for it but will not risk their skins, the ten will give the law to the twenty.

That is what happened in Scotland when John Knox chased Mary Stuart out of the realm for murdering her husband. And that is what happened in England in the mid-seventeenth century, when the Puritans rebelled against Charles I. The immediate result was that the Presbyterians ruled in Scotland and the Puritans in England.

Our students should know about these events, and should be taught to trace, and to understand, the reasons why both regimes fell so quickly to a return to the monarchy and the “divine” right of kings. For it was refugees from James I, Charles I and Charles II who really settled the land which became the United States; and adherents of Calvin and Knox who set its direction. Our children should know that the leaders of the New England colony were Cambridge graduates {170} and among the theological leaders of their period.

It is equally important that they should know that the great achievement of Cromwell was to prove that it is only by abridging the authority of the state that the liberty of churches can be assured. That is the historic basis of our First Amendment.

But it is more important that we do not repeat the errors of history, while attempting to improve on its triumphs. The Puritan revolution under Cromwell, for instance, succeeded so briefly that its history is ultimately depressing. The Puritan armies harbored all sorts of religious fanatics. Ranters, Levellers, Quakers, and others who plucked apart the riches of the Bible to condense them into single issues, or arguments to create and maintain dissension.

After Cromwell died, his Puritan army lost its coherence and, lacking coherence, its direction, its purpose. Then tyranny returned, the Restoration, with its unbridled behavior in terms of government. We should know that sequence in the event of the successful Reconstruction toward which we are working today.

What went wrong during the Puritan regime? Quite simply, men sought to guide the immediate issues of the world in terms of the eternal and forgot the world of temporal ideas, of books beyond the Bible, of education beyond the needs of the church and into the nature of the world. It is not too much to expect Christians to understand and to span both worlds, the City of Men and the City of God, to use Augustine's terms. We live, after all, in the world, and knowledge of God is engraved, as St. Paul said, in our hearts.

We should recall, therefore, that the progress unleashed by the Reformation soon grew out of hand. Because scientific explorations into God's universe became as honorable a vocation as all others to which men are called, the Reformation encouraged the rise of scientific experiment and research. As these were met with increasing success, the men of science began to believe that Reason should displace religion, that man could chart his own unaided course, throughout time and the universe. Such illusions were encouraged by the failure of the Puritan revolution to make itself permanent. The return of Absolute rulers through all Europe by 1770 made the union of science and state seem as irresistible as church and state in previous periods.

This led, during the so-called Age of Reason, to the French Revolution, the great prototype of all modern left-wing revolutions. It promised freedom and provided slavery. It promised reason and provided terror. It ended, after massacres, in the dictatorship of Napoleon. Yet its example of the rise of the unworthy inspired the {171} Russian revolution and all left-wing revolutions ever since. Above all, the French revolution showed the enemies of Christianity that such a campaign, mounted inside a Christian nation, could, however briefly, succeed. Imitators set out to make such a triumph permanent, and they are still at work on that effort.

Meanwhile, the nations of Europe moved into the nineteenth century, and after a period of brief reaction from the French experiment, moved into a new period of self-described Enlightenment, led by Humanists in science, men who believed

that there is no higher power in the universe than man.

Three such men appeared in the nineteenth century, and their influence has extended on both academic and popular levels to dominate the world of ideas in our time. These are Darwin, Marx and Freud. To understand the age in which we live and the forces against which we contend, we should know what these men have argued, and how to demolish their arguments.

Philosopher R.F. Baum has said,

From Darwin stems the idea that competitive brute struggle for existence produced and in the last analysis still governs all existing species, including man. From Marx stems the idea that economic need and interest determine human thought and history. To Freud we owe the notion that human beings are driven and in the end accounted for by a mainly sexual "libido."

Darwin, Marx and Freud have gone far toward persuading educated people that opinions and ideas do little more than register the instincts and circumstance of those who hold them. Hence all ideas come to seem equally involuntary and irrational, hence equally true or false—or, as many have learned to write and think it, equally "true" or "false" in sophisticated quotes. Where that suspicion or conviction gains a lodging, any effort toward impersonal or objective truth seems naive; any claim to base belief on fact and logic becomes the object of a knowing smile.

Such sophistication teeters on the edge of nihilism, and frequently falls in. It is dangerous because it tends at every point of human disagreement to denigrate and preclude rational argument. If unchecked it will make force, perhaps at first the force of money or World Opinion, but ultimately the force of numbers and weapons not the last but the first resort....The very faculties and discipline required to prevent a...slide into brutishness are discouraged, undermined, belittled. It does not seem an accident that the century {172} aiming confidently at Progress and applying to Darwin, Marx and Freud for marching orders has been a century of world wars, genocide and totalitarian tyrannies.

These thinkers, in other words, have launched theories in which man is only an animal. And the acceptance of such theories, and their applications, results in animal behavior.

I shall not dwell on how much and how often Darwin, Marx and Freud retreated from their original positions in the face of

scholarly objections and questions. Let it suffice to say that their theories have been not only shot down, but torn apart. Those who still teach them are seldom equipped to defend them, and cling to them despite their inadequacies mainly because they serve as so many disguises to promote anti-Christianity.

We need to know, and to be able to penetrate, these disguises. We need to know the difference between reason and a rejection of God. We need to teach our children not to shun the world, because they will live in it all their lives, but to learn it and learn it so well they will not fall into its traps. To know that Plato was a Sophist. To know that the Renaissance was the decline of Christianity and the rise of tyranny. To know that the Puritan Revolution was the first in western history in which a king was executed for breaking the law, and to know that the French Revolution was a squalid imitation of the Puritan and the American, which failed because it did not have the faith of the Puritans or the Americans.

We want to raise a generation that is both holy and worldly, that can understand that Augustine and Calvin provided the Reformation with a coherent, consistent body of thought and explanation that can buttress a civilization greater than any ever known, richer and more variegated—a true reflection of the One and the Many, based on a reasoned faith. We need to raise a generation learned in secular fallacies and the theological heresies.

That, to me, is an education. To be so educated is to soar above what universities have to teach, excepting in the area of specialized skills. Such an education arms the student with the reasons upon which the success of his life will depend and will lead him toward the fulfillment of his vocation.

EDUCATION FOR SERVICE

Ovid E. Need Jr.

As I have been reading and studying the Bible, I have noticed a consistent trait which runs throughout the great writers and heroes of the Scriptures. With some exceptions, these great men of faith would have been considered insignificant in the eyes of their worldly contemporaries. We read of the prophet Amos, who was called from among the herdsmen. David, before being anointed king of Israel, was also a lowly shepherd boy. Moses, though he became a prince of Egypt and leader of Israel, was of lowly birth, and it took 40 years of existence as a nomadic herdsman before he learned how God would use him. We also have Paul, whose Spirit-led evangelism changed the world, but who consistently down-played his own human abilities. It was Paul who noted that God does not use the wisdom of the world but the very things which seem foolish to the world and to the natural man in order to accomplish His divine purposes.

As I considered these things, I was impressed with where we in fundamental Christianity find ourselves today on this issue. We seem to be moving to the point, if we are not already there, where we put *as much emphasis on humanistic education as the world does*. Many of those who profess Christ today turn a deaf ear to those who are not from a “top name college” or have the right set of letters behind their names. I think this was a major reason some of the humble prophets of Scripture were ignored in their days, as well. {176}

I continually hear of the need for more information, rather than more obedience to our Sovereign Lord God as the answer to our ills. Have we allowed the emphasis to be placed on the accumulation of facts rather than on obedience to God’s Law-Word and prayer? Look at what has happened within the last 50–75 years. We have seen society remove itself from God’s Word very

rapidly. Is it because Christians have lost their influence in society by allowing the emphasis to be shifted from how God can use His humble servants to what mighty deeds man do himself?

Christ is the light of the world, and we are children of light and commanded to walk as children of light (Ephesians 5:8). Our light is to shine, and the way this is done is through obedience to our Lord in every area (John 3:20–21). Here we see, as in other places, that God puts the emphasis on knowing His Word and obeying it, not on worldly learning or any other of the modern-day techniques toward realizing human potential.

“God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are; that no flesh should glory in His presence, but of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, that according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord” (1 Corinthians 1:28–31).

Notice here the major principle—the more emphasis that is placed on worldly education, the less likely God is to use the person. I am not here espousing a generally anti-education position. I am highlighting the principle that we must not substitute an education for the necessity of a consistent walk with God. When a person can keep these two things in proper balance, then higher education is certainly an advantage. But such balance is found in few people.

If knowledge and obedience are not kept in proper balance, the individual is operating without God and his power to affect society has been compromised. When we place our emphasis where the world does, we have fallen into the snare of the devil. This was the error of those who scoffed at the standing of the Old Testament prophets and thereby refused to hear their warnings from God. The people would not “heed the word of the Lord” as spoken through the “foolish things of this world,” and the result was total destruction of the nation by the heathen.

We need God to deliver us from the snare of worldly wisdom. One {177} national Christian school curriculum program originally placed its emphasis on Christian character in the teachers, but

now emphasizes teachers' educational "qualifications" and upward professional mobility. As a consequence, rather than developing Christian character, Christian school teachers are reproducing children who see training and technique as the basic keys to success and prosperity.

According to the Word of God, a dependence on worldly "means" rather than attentiveness to divinely given Wisdom will result in death. God's people today are becoming as dependent on the same means of success as are the devil's children. We are adopting the errors of the *Humanist Manifesto*, which reads at one point. "Man will learn to face the crises of life in terms of his knowledge of [humanity's] naturalness and probability. Reasonable and manly attitudes will be fostered by education and supported by custom." The truth is, however, that any training which does not equip man to face the "crises of life" in terms of applying God's word is idolatrous and false.

Education which can be viewed with the attitude. "This will better equip me to *serve God* and my fellow man" is Godly education and can be used for His glory. Rather than training children to be "leaders," our schools should be teaching the importance of being a servant of the Lord (Matthew 23:11). We need training in humility before God (1 Peter 5:5-6) and in prayer (Luke 18). We need to learn how to meditate on Him and His Word (Psalm 1), and how to obey Him in everything by faith. And we need to learn the *absolute necessity* of studying God's Word for ourselves (2 Tim. 2:5, 3:16).

Education alone does not qualify us to be used by our Lord. Only our submission to Him and the principles of His Word qualify us for service under His kingship. He may be pleased to see that we obtain an education, but when we look at that education as our means to accomplishment, we have made it our god.

4.
*ECONOMICS
AND CHANGE*

SUCCESSFUL STEWARDSHIP

Joseph R. McAuliffe

The Christian Reconstruction movement has made a significant impact upon many quarters of the church with its emphasis on bringing every area of life into subjection to the Lordship of Christ and His Law-Word. Reconstructionists have correctly identified one of the biggest problems in the church today: “cafeteria line Christianity.” This basically humanistic approach to the faith is characterized by the believer, through self-determination, selecting which aspects of the faith appeal to his spiritual appetite and rejecting the rest. A cursory glance at many churches suggests that most advocates of cafeteria line Christianity have a fondness for the dessert section.

Granted there are aspects of the Christian faith that are more appetizing than others. Reflecting on the joy of our salvation is a far more pleasing *hors d'oeuvre* than the demand to pick up our cross daily. Regardless, we are required to partake of God’s complete menu (the spinach as well as the chocolate cheese cake) or risk spiritual malnourishment. We must accept and apply the comprehensive claims of God’s Word that address every area of life.

A tragedy of modern Christianity has been the studied neglect of the marketplace by the church. Dorothy Sayers has aptly stated. “In nothing has the church so lost her hold on reality as in her failure to understand and respect the secular vocation. She has allowed work and religion to become separate departments, and is astonished to find that, as a result, the secular work of the world is turned to purely {180} selfish and destructive ends, become irreligious, or at least, uninterested in religion. But is it astonishing? How can anyone remain interested in a religion which seems to have no concern with nine-tenths of life?”

One other area of revelation that many contemporary, cafeteria-

style Christians have bypassed is financial stewardship. The problem really is not new. Martin Luther commented in his day that “every Christian needs two conversions...one for his soul and the other from his pocketbook.” Humans have always had an inordinate relationship with money, which explains why the Scriptures have so much to say about the subject. There are more than 2,000 verses that address the subject of money and possessions—twice as many references as there are for faith and prayer combined. Nonetheless, we capriciously pass over these “unspiritual” references, not realizing that there are serious consequences for neglecting to subdue this area of our lives to God.

“I’ll do anything God wants me to do,” a pastor recently told me., “except turn my finances over to Him. I feel I need to control that one area of my life.” Of course, his own personal finances were out of control, which was why he came to me for counsel. Jesus specifically enjoins us to be responsible in our relationship to money. “He who is faithful in a very little thing is faithful also in much; and he who is unrighteous in a very little thing is unrighteous also in much. If therefore you have not been faithful in the use of unrighteous mammon, who will entrust the true riches to you?” (Luke 16:10–11). We are called to be faithful to God in every area of life, yet because of our propensity to become humanistic with money, Jesus draws special attention to it.

Unfaithfulness in the use of money will deprive us of the true riches of God. The true riches of God are material/physical, intellectual, relational, vocational, and spiritual. The true riches of God can be illustrated by the magnitude and diversity of the blessing of God mentioned in the first thirteen verses of Deuteronomy 28. These blessings for faithfulness include protection, physical health, vocational fruitfulness, healthy children, victory in battle, prosperity, joy, leadership, abundance, and intimacy with the Lord Himself. Yet if we are unfaithful in our use of money, Jesus says that we ought not to expect the true riches of God, and unfortunately this has been the lot of most Christians.

Many reasons could be mentioned as to why Christians have fallen into financial unfaithfulness: our fallen propensity towards greed, materialistic culture, the deceptive snare of riches, and our {181} unbelief in God’s sovereignty over our lives. My years of

counseling have led me to conclude that the primary reasons why Christians have been unfaithful in their relationship to money is due to a failure to comprehend the meaning and responsibilities of stewardship.

Stewardship is an alien concept to twentieth-century Christians, even though it is the essence of what it means to be Christian. A steward is one who has been entrusted to responsibly administer the affairs of another. Stewardship embodies two important facets: 1) outside ownership, and 2) responsible management. The Scriptures affirm that God, by virtue of creation, is the possessor of all that exists, making humans totally accountable to God. Fallen man adamantly resists the biblical doctrine of creation, to the extent that he will take a leap of faith to embrace the irrational theory of evolution in order to escape the inevitable implications of stewardship that are inherent in the revelation of God as creator.

The Christian is called to an even higher sense of stewardship under God by virtue of the redemptive work of Christ. He is utterly answerable to God because he has been purchased by the blood of Christ. “and that you are not your own, for you have been bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body” (I Corinthians 6:19c–20). God has an absolute claim over our lives because He is our creator and redeemer.

The self-glorifying spirit of our age has greatly undermined believers from identifying themselves as servants of God. biblical concepts such as slavery, stewardship, servanthood, submission, obedience and humility seem like antiquated relics from a dark age in our modern vernacular and thought. The unfortunate consequence for the church has been a blurred witness as it simply mirrors the self-actualizing, narcissistic, me-first culture it is supposed to be transforming.

The testimonies of the apostles present us with a striking contrast. Paul, in his salutation to the Romans, identifies himself as. “a bondservant of Jesus Christ, called as an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God” (Romans 1:1) Peter, James, and Jude similarly designate themselves first as bondservants of Christ, before attesting to their apostleship or ministry (2 Peter 1:1; James 1:1; Jude 1). The Greek word for bondservant is *doulos*, which means “one who defers his own interests to those of his Lord.” Perhaps God entrusted these men with the high calling of apostleship

because of their awareness of the primacy of their identity and status as bondservants of Christ.

How uncommon it is today to hear Christians, particularly pastors, evangelists, or other leaders in the church, refer to themselves first in {182} terms of “their” stewardship status. As a pastor, I am continually asked to help people ascertain “their” ministry, “their gifts, or “their” calling. I have also observed that Christians who are preoccupied with simply serving Christ, rarely have such queries. Generally speaking, they are too busy doing the work of God to concern themselves with such issues. I know of one man who has traveled all over the country attending “discover your spiritual gifts” seminars and taking ministry, personality, and temperament-determining tests to supposedly help him serve God. The whole program bears a distinct similarity to the astrological nonsense of “What’s your sign?” with the new question being, “What’s your ministry?” Rather than identifying ourselves as Libras or Geminis, we can be prophets, teachers or several other types, each with their complete package of behavioral characteristics that tell us who we really are. Neat.

The second aspect of stewardship is responsible administration. Paul delineates this feature of stewardship by stating, “moreover, it is *required* of stewards, that one be found trustworthy” (1 Cor. 4:2, *emphasis added*). It is important that stewards be faithful in discharging the duties allotted to them or else they will be disqualified from receiving the rewards of their stewardship. The parable of the talents recorded in Matthew 25 provides us with the primary features of the responsible administration of whatever God allots to our care.

The first feature is that God is the source of whatever we possess and we are to steward that possession to His glory. All too often we fail to heed the Mosaic admonition and arrogantly affirm, “otherwise, you may say in your heart, “my power and the strength of my hand made me this wealth.” The second half of the admonition is the essential prescription. “But you shall remember the Lord your God, for it is He who is giving you the power to make wealth, that He may confirm His covenant” (Deut. 8:17–18). The Christian practice of offering thanks before we eat ought to be applied to our approach towards work and possessions. We know that God is the source of the food we eat, although many

intermediaries are involved—from the farmer to the cook—before it ends up on our plate. Similarly, there are innumerable intermediaries involved in the production of our jobs and possessions, but it is God who ultimately is the source of who we are and what we have.

The second feature of stewardship is recognizing that God grants us talents, resources, and responsibilities that vary with each individual. The equalitarian and envious spirit of our age endeavors to remove all distinctions of responsibility and leads to the disease of {183} other-guy-itis. The response of Jesus to other-guy-itis is most telling. When the disciple Peter asked Jesus about the fate of a fellow disciple, John, saying, “Lord, and what about this man?” Jesus replied, “If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you? You follow Mel” (John 21:21–22). The uneven distribution of gifts, abilities, aptitudes, and possessions is a fact of life. Success is measured by maximizing those talents, however great or small. Failure is assured by complaining and being anxious about the apparent inequalities.

The third feature of stewardship is the efficient use of time. The one who received five talents *immediately* went out and traded (Matt. 25:16). The writer of Proverbs exhorts us to observe the self-governing ant who in contrast to the indolent, prepares her food in summer and gathers her provision in harvest (Prov. 6:6–11). Perhaps the most significant text on time and the mystery of the marketplace is the first half of Ecclesiastes 3, where 28 distinct time periods are mentioned. Basic to successful stewardship is the apprehension of the appropriate time period of the marketplace and responding accordingly. We must, like the sons of Issachar, understand the times and thereby know what to do.

Next is the principle of productivity. The one-talent man in the Matthew 25 parable irresponsibly buried his resource in the ground where it could do no good. Good stewards bring forth increase and fruitfulness by industriously using the resources God has provided them. While God is fundamentally the source of all productivity, we cannot discount the medium of man’s labor as a principle secondary cause. I’m reminded of the gardener who, in response to a passer-by who commented on how gracious God was in transforming this formerly destitute sandlot into such a lovely botanical paradise, replied, “Yeah, you should have seen it

last year when He had it all to Himself.”

The fifth feature is accountability. The steward must at some point render an account to the one over him. In the area of financial stewardship, I believe it is essential to maintain a budget book that records every financial transaction in order to give an accurate account. Most Christians are unaware that they are called to be accountants, but Paul instructs us that “each of us shall give account of himself to God” (Rom. 14:12). Financial accountability is a great need in the church today. The single biggest problem people have with their finances is what I call the Diet Pepsi syndrome. “Now you see it...Now you don’t.” The way some Christians are able to make their money disappear is enough to make you believe in magic. The solution for this strange phenomenon is faithful budgeting and {184} submitting to financial accountability.

The sixth feature of stewardship is the rewards of faithfulness. God promises to bless those who are faithful enough to live their entire lives in terms of His Law-Word. God blessed the two faithful men in the parable with approbation (“Well done”) and promotion. Acceptance in God’s Kingdom is always on the basis of His mercy and grace, yet promotion is always rooted in faithful performance! Blessing is based on performance, not potential.

The last characteristic is the dire consequence for those who are irresponsible in their stewardship. Life is not static nor inconsequential; you will reap what you sow. God is gracious and long-suffering, but He is not reluctant to mete out judgment to those who are unfaithful to their charge, as He does to the unfaithful steward.

The unfaithful steward attributes his failure to produce to his allegedly miserly master. The faithful steward of Christ is motivated to produce by the revelation he possesses of the goodness and greatness of God. Considering all that God has produced within and for us, how can we not be productive for Him?

LOVE AND MONEY IN THE SOCIAL ORDER

The Priority of People over Things

R.E. McMaster, Jr.

Tucked away in the Pyrenees Mountains of northeast Spain, nestled in a long persecuted area known as the Basque, lies the all but unknown little village of Mondragon. Establishment forces have many times attempted to oppress the people here. For example, in this century during the 1920s, many Basque towns and villages were active in the Spanish anarchist movement. The people even went so far as to eliminate government money from their villages and replace it with a simple barter system. Not only does this financial action show the fierce independence and rugged individuality of the area, but it also demonstrates that these people have some idea about what real money and honest economics are all about.

The Basque stood and fought against Franco. When Franco achieved victory, he outlawed their language and required them to speak Spanish. All this did was reinforce the solidarity and community spirit of these rugged people.

In 1941, a Catholic priest who had fought in the Spanish Civil War, Father Jose Maria Arizmendi, was assigned to Mondragon. Father Arizmendi, understanding that faith without works is dead (James 2), {186} began implementing social and economic systems at Mondragon which prove indeed that religion is essentially involved in economics (human action). Since the Catholic Church had never officially supported either capitalism or socialism, Father Arizmendi sought to pull the best from both systems for use in his development plans at Mondragon.

Balance

It is not surprising that this priest was successful. For, since debt capitalism emphasizes radical individualism and socialism stresses radical collectivism, if the strong points of both systems can be harmonized, then the basic problem of humanity is resolved, to wit. *How do you balance off the rights of individuals with those of collective society?*

Despite nearly a half century of success, Father Arizmendi's work at Mondragon just recently began to come to light. The BBC produced a film entitled, *Mondragon: An Experiment*. Perhaps the most knowledgeable individual on Mondragon in the United States is Dr. Terry Mollner, who authored *The Mondragon Cooperatives and Trusteeship* (Trusteeship Institute, Inc., Shutesbury, Mass.). Dr. Mollner also wrote a short summary of the history and results of the Mondragon economic experiment for the April 1986 issue of *Green Revolution* (R.D. 1, Spring Grove, Penn. 17362). The facts concerning Mondragon are drawn largely from Dr. Manner's work.

The linear sequence from the abstract to the concrete runs as follows: religion → philosophy → creative ideas unifying thoughts with matter → work → material achievement (economics). Father Arizmendi struck the right sequence and chords in human nature in structuring both his worker cooperatives and the bank of Mondragon. Small wonder then that his economic experiment is successful. Thoughts precede action. Ideas have consequences. When the rights of the individual (capitalism) are balanced off with the rights of collective society (socialism/communism), harmony results.

The strengths of pure capitalism are its emphasis on individual character development, professional performance of a task, freedom, incentive to work, the primary use of the contract which permits horizontal relationships (equality), and finally when correctly formulated, that self-interest is only served as a by-product of first serving one's fellow man. The worst of capitalism—dog-eat-dog evolutionary conflict for the survival of the fittest, OPM, debt money which is not a commodity, and competition for the purpose of {187} win/lose—is discarded.

The worst aspects of communism/socialism are also discarded—

forced cooperation and communal activity (slavery) enforced by a militaristic, oppressive bureaucracy; no individual incentive to be productive or to work; no individuality which allows the development, expression and free use of one's unique God-given talents. The best of communism/socialism is retained—the idea that *workers should be owners of the means of production* (if they earn it); the emphasis on cooperation, harmony and community spirit; *the greatest good for the greatest number*, but not at the expense of killing individualism. (Balance must be maintained.)

While no student of economic theory, Father Arizmendi stumbled upon the reality that economic prosperity only flourishes long-term in an environment of cooperation rather than conflict. (Competition rightfully implemented short-term is only for the purpose of serving, not win/lose. If conflict produced economic prosperity, there would be no such thing as *flight capital*. Instead people would invest in Lebanon, Nicaragua, Iran, etc.) Father Arizmendi because he was a priest, captured this cooperative idea in terms of a primary characteristic of God—*love*. *God is love*. Because of God's love, he effectively reasoned, *people* are more important than *things*. Furthermore, when and where there is *love* between *people*, they treat *things* differently than where conflict exists. Where there is love, there is more voluntary sharing, justice, and give and take—more cooperation concerning *things*. Where there is not *love*, however, where conflict reigns between men, *things* become a catalyst for even greater conflict. Instead of sharing, there exists hoarding, envy, theft, suspicion, injustice and greed. *Things* become more important than *people* in a conflict-ridden society which lacks *love*.

Matter exists in time and space. On the other hand, people and their relationships can become timeless and spaceless. Therefore, people are more important than *things*. With this handle on economic reality, Father Arizmendi set to work....

(Permit me to digress for a moment and put into American economic terms the similarity between this writer's work and that of this Spanish Catholic philosopher. The work of Father Arizmendi is akin in both philosophy and in implementation to what I came up with for Guatemala when I worked there in 1983.)

There are only two parts of the economic equation: land and labor, or in other words, *people* and *things*. *People* are more

important than *things* because *people* determine the production, distribution and use of *things*, including money. Stated differently, all {188} problems are human problems.

Man faces four basic conflicts on this earth. conflict with God, conflict with himself, conflict with his fellow man, and conflict with nature. When these four conflicts are resolved, peace and prosperity exist on earth. God is served, our fellow man is served, and we ourselves are served, in a healthy environment. This is much of what my book, *No Time for Slaves*, is all about. This is a win-win-win-win covenant.

A Bank Men Can Bank On

The final point of progression of Father Arizmendi's work, the crowning glory of his economic experiment, is the *Caja Laboral Popular* (The Bank of the People's Labor). This bank, headquartered in Mondragon, is active in nearly every village throughout the Basque region of Spain. This cooperative bank has 120 branches, and is both a custodian and investor of the deposits of nearly 400,000 families. Not bad expansion for a bank founded in a church basement 32 years ago (1958).

This bank has a clearly defined objective. to create worker-owned jobs for the community. So in its purpose, The Bank of the People's Labor has given incentive to individuals to work and also become owners of the means of production for the purpose of serving their fellow man, and as a by-product, serving themselves. And it all began with a man who was seeking first to serve God. As a result, *the Mondragon bank has a 100 percent success rate at forming industrial cooperatives and making loans*. It has experienced no failures. By contrast, in the United States, only one out of ten new businesses will survive the first five years. But then again, the investment philosophy and approach of the Mondragon bank is to invest in *people*, not *things*. As we have already seen, people are more important than *things*, if for no other reason than because *people* determine the disposition of *things*, for good or for evil. Therefore, the best investment is always in *people*, if people can become the ultimate resource, rather than predators or parasites in society.

The investment priorities of the Mondragon bank are: 1) workers,

2) managers, 3) the good or service to be produced, and 4) capital/money. This is just the opposite of what exists under the Western debt capitalistic system today. Here the emphasis is on: 1) capital, 2) the good or service, 3) management, and 4) workers.

Western debt capitalism and communism both stress the development of capital—things. (Dialectic *materialism* is basic to {189} communism.) But because capital/money is effectively stored energy or stored labor, we inevitably get back to the character, professionalism, incentive and work habits of *people* as primary for producing *things*, for making money. So we are reaping what we have sown today in the West. Because we put *things* first—*things* before *people*—we are under economic, political, social and spiritual distress. Only 2 percent of Americans are financially and economically self-sufficient at age 65, while 96 percent are flat broke, and dependent upon shaky pensions, bankrupt Social Security, etc., to stay alive economically. Then we have the bankrupt federal government and the pitiful U.S. dollar. We are effectively bankrupt economically as a society.

Debt capitalism does not produce *the greatest good for the greatest number*, either. Far from it. Only two-tenths of 1 percent of all Americans are millionaires. Only 15 percent of Americans are capitalists these days. The bureaucrats who produce nothing constructive consume our wealth, if the international banks don't give it or loan it away first. And 3 percent of the U.S. population owns 85 percent of the private land in the United States. This is worse than in El Salvador. In California, only 1 percent of the population owns two-thirds of the private land.

Spiritually, we are also dead ducks. Our sad spiritual state of affairs is readily seen by the fact that the largest sales in U.S. drug stores are for: 1) Mylanta, 2) Anacin, and 3) Bayer aspirin. In dollar amount of sales in U.S. drug stores, No. 2 is Anacin, No. 3 is Tylenol, and No. 4 is Advil [figures as of April 1988.] The bankruptcy of our governmental, religious and economic systems is literally giving all of us a collective headache and worse. The cancer death rate is up 8.7 percent. We are in a death spiral down. Further reflecting this death spiral, the United States ranks first globally in military expenditures, and leads the world in military technology, military bases globally, and nuclear warheads and bombs.

Of course, it's worse under communism. There the bureaucracy is far more extensively developed. (Bureaucracy is the greatest institutional manifestation of human evil.) The greatest class distinctions economically in the world today exist in the Soviet Union. The highest ranking members of the Communist Party and their obedient bureaucrats have lived like kings, like gods, while the masses of people stand in line to buy toilet paper. Furthermore, every Russian woman on average has six abortions, while Russian men drink themselves to death. The eyes of the Soviet people show no sparkle of life. Reflecting this, the U.S.S.R. ranks 44th globally in {190} life expectancy and second in weapons expenditures. The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. together, with less than 11 percent of the world's population, account for 60 percent of global military expenditures, 80 percent of the weapons research, and 97 percent of all nuclear weapons. It's a miserable life at either extreme of individualism (debt capitalism) or collectivism (communism).

The Mondragon Model

Because Mondragon has discovered rightfully that *people* are more important than *things*, the Mondragon bank invests first and foremost in *people*. The Mondragon bankers figure the good or service produced will take care of itself in time. If the investment is made in the right people, and people can work cooperatively, professionally, effectively and efficiently, then the bank and business can always change the good or service produced to meet the needs of the marketplace.

Based on this philosophy of a primary investment in people, because the bank is a cooperative bank where the people themselves have a stake, the result is that the entire community backs the bank and the businesses it creates. *The entire community is business-oriented. The workers, managers, owners, consumers and bankers as owners of the means of production are all one and the same, or at least closely tied to one another. People in Mondragon are literally investing in themselves. Business is a blessing at Mondragon in the Basque, rather than the curse it has been here in the West.*

Furthermore, the *bank backs the people and their businesses when they get into trouble*. Why shouldn't it be that way? The

people are simply backing themselves. In fact, the bank makes a commitment to both the people involved and the business to back them until they succeed. If the good or service produced has to be changed, so what? It's changed. *People* are more important than *things*. *People* produce *things*. Therefore, the primary investment is in *people!* You can desert the *thing*, but not the *people*.

If a business falls on hard times or is struggling, *the bank's entrepreneurial division has a policy of lowering the interest rate on loans to these worker-owned cooperatives as business gets riskier*. This is a long-term view. *Short-term plan for long-term gain* has always been necessary for success in any human endeavor. At Mondragon—*all for one and one for all*—voluntarily, with incentives, maintains balance between individuals and collective {191} society. Again, because workers, managers, owners, the bank depositors, the bank and consumers are all one and the same and all tied together, everyone has a vested interest in seeing that every worker-owned business is ultimately successful. This further provides *lifetime job security*, even though the business itself may change by way of a new or different good or service, depending on what the market demands. *Crisis management is thereby also avoided*. *Stress is minimized* if not mostly eliminated.

If these people had honest free-market money, based in some ultimate physical reality, such as they effectively did during the Spanish Civil War, the sky would be the limit economically.

Can we as Americans imagine an economic and financial system where our investments are secure, our savings are indeed safe and growing in real terms, without inflation or deflation, where workers do not have to worry about absentee ownership, new management, being fired or transferred, or losing their jobs due to a plant or business closing?

How Mondragon Works

Just how does a business get started at Mondragon? First of all, a group of men (friends) voluntarily get together and decide they want to start a new business. So people who already have a covenantal and contractual relationship with one another (love), get together and decide to work together (things) (money). Thus, spiritual and economic realities are in basic harmony to begin with.

Each member of this business starter group has to *put his money where his mouth is*. He is required to have a financial stake in the venture. He is required to be a true capitalist. Each member loans the business some of his own capital. Therefore, the individual group members are literally at risk. Then they go to the bank.

At the Mondragon bank, the bank's entrepreneurial division interviews the business starter group regarding their request for the bank's assistance. The bank's first priority is to determine if there is truly a loving bond and solid relationship between the various people in the proposed business start-up group. This is the basis, the foundation, for the new business—people and love. If the bank is happy with both the character and covenantal relationships of the group members seeking to start a new business, the bank then joins into a partnership with the business on behalf of its depositors, for the purpose of creating this new worker-owned cooperative.

Both the bank and the group desiring to form the new business {192} are committed to work and provide capital until the business is running profitably, effectively and efficiently. Everyone has a stake in the venture, both short-term and long-term. The investment is by way of both *people* and *capital*, with priorities being in that correct order, followed by *things* or *service*.

Next, democracy comes into play. The business start-up group meets by itself and chooses one of its members to be the manager of the new business. Next, important long-term strategic planning commences. This elected manager is required to spend two years working with an expert of the bank for the purpose of developing both a plan for the business and a community development plan. Thus, the goals of the individuals of the business group are required to be in harmony with those of the community generally. Individual/group profit incentive, market need and social need are balanced off in two years of long-term planning. Community considerations such as housing, parks, commercial development and other community services are considered.

Now, when all this is eventually accomplished, the good or service to be produced is finalized. This product or service must be determined to be in the best interest of the people of the community long-term before the bank will finance it in partnership with the business group. In other words, the people are deciding

with their own money what they really want in the marketplace and their community. Consumer sovereignty is effectively king by determining producer investment.

Now, practically speaking, the process is not all this cut and dried. The group of friends who decided they wanted to work together and form a business to serve the community (and as a by-product meet their personal needs), had a good idea going in about what good or service they wanted to produce, before they got into partnership with the bank and established their worker-owned jobs. The members of the group came together, bringing their strengths of character, commitment and specialized professional skills, such as in electronics. It's how they will use these skills, let's say in electronic technology, to produce a specific electronic good which is decided last of all.

An extensive market study is conducted to determine the true needs of the community. In fact, everything that makes for a successful business is carefully covered at Mondragon. Most businesses fail due to insufficient capital, poor accounting, inadequate and inept management, labor problems, no strategic or tactical business plan, no marketing plan, and a good or service {193} produced which is not desired by the marketplace. All of these problems are solved front end, going in, to the maximum extent possible, before the business ever gets off the ground at Mondragon. No wonder Mondragon has a 100 percent success rate. They are doing everything right. Success, making honest money, is a by-product of doing things correctly.

The bank's entrepreneurial division has two bank worker-owners who are involved full time in identifying new products needed by the community, which require new businesses to produce. So the emphasis is clearly on research and development, and production over against consumption. Smart! This is true, progressive capitalism. Furthermore, down the line, if the manager is found to be incompetent, he is demoted back to the group and a new manager is chosen. He is not fired, just demoted. If the good or service is found not to be viable, a new good or service is developed, even if it means new, expensive capital equipment has to be purchased. So, excellence in both people and produce are demanded at Mondragon. Incompetence and failure are punished in their own careful, loving way. These Mondragon cooperative

businesses stress both responsiveness to the marketplace by way of the consumer demanded goods or services, as well as excellence in individual productivity and management. Small wonder the bank has never suffered a loan default.

Mondragon, with its primary and correct emphasis on people, finds group strength coming together voluntarily in a loving and supportive atmosphere. Individuals find themselves and meet both their love and money needs by voluntary, contractual exchange (with incentives for hard work), by losing themselves in their service to their community. Thus, the balance between their individual self-identity and the community's collective identity are in balance. Harmony, peace and prosperity inescapably have resulted.

Since 1958, the Mondragon Bank of the People's Labor has produced 20,000 worker-owned jobs and more than 100 cooperative businesses. Eighty-six of these cooperatives are industrial enterprises. These industrial enterprises produce everything from home appliances, such as toasters and refrigerators, to tools, such as sophisticated die presses, down to plastic rulers.

These eighty-six cooperative industrial enterprises are the top producers in all of Spain. Their productivity per worker is also the highest in that country. Their profitability is nearly double that of their competitors. An independent study by the Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Industrial Society found the management of these {194} cooperatives (which was chosen by the group of owner-workers and approved by the bank) to be some of the most aggressive and innovative ever witnessed by the Foundation's staff. Needless to say, these worker-owners were also found by the Foundation to be highly motivated and fulfilled by their jobs.

If we do things right, things usually turn out right, given justice and honest money.

Projects other than industrial ventures have proven to be successful as well. There are pre-order and small-town-business, storefront-type, food cooperatives which have been successfully established. A *consumer cooperative*, Eroskl, has 120,000 members and 72 stores throughout the Basque. Some are small mom-and-pop-type operations. Others are more like K-Mart. Additionally,

there are six agricultural cooperatives, fourteen housing cooperatives, forty-three cooperative schools, and four separate cooperatives which provide services to the other cooperatives. These four service cooperatives are the bank itself, a technical research institute, a League of Education and Culture (which has a technological division, a business and professional school), and a social security and medical cooperative. In other words, *the people through their work and productivity in their own businesses*, and through their own bank, have financed their own health, education and welfare needs. Government involvement is not only unnecessary, It is totally unwanted!

Can we imagine the results of totally eliminating the civil government's involvement in economics and in the health, education and welfare segments of the federal budget? The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is the largest item in the federal budget. The simple people of Mondragon are telling us that such civil government involvement is totally unnecessary, not to mention the fact that HHS primarily serves the bureaucrats and doesn't really meet the needs of the people whom it is purported to serve.

Give these tough-minded people at Mondragon their own high-tech, self-defense militia, which they would naturally gravitate toward anyway, along with a good civil defense, and no power on earth could challenge them. (This is why the world leaves Israel and Switzerland alone. The people of Israel and Switzerland are responsible for their own defense, beginning on the local level.)

(Civil government which is local is more responsive, frugal and responsible. Civil government literally becomes what it should be, a service for which the people contract [a constitution], for the limited purpose of providing for defense against all enemies foreign and {195} domestic, for putting down insurrections, revolutions and riots, and for enforcing contracts. That's it, the total purpose of civil government. Civil government has no legitimate function in economics, in the areas of the production, distribution, or use of resources.)

There is an aspect of the Mondragon worker-owner program with which I take issue (in addition to their lack of free market, honest, commodity money). The salary scale among the worker-owner groups business cooperatives is restricted. No worker-

owner can receive a salary greater than four and one-half times that of the lowest paid worker in the worker-owner business. While this keeps economic equity (and therefore real power) balanced in the community, it would seem to come at the expense of maximizing incentive long-term. (By the way, the salary ratio from the highest. to the lowest-paid worker in the United States today exceeds 100 to 1.) Furthermore, because the lowest salary paid is only slightly above minimum wage, the highest salary paid at Mondragon is significantly lower than the salaries paid to men who work in the more conventional business sector. However, because these Mondragon workers are owners of the means of production, the worker-owner's share of profits usually makes up for the lower salary.

It would seem that the percentage of the profits and dividends paid by the business each year should be in proportion to the contribution made and should therefore include the salary earned by each individual worker-owner. In other words, in this manner, a natural aristocracy would arise. Those who earn more will be those who produced and therefore served the most. Who could argue with this? An individual who has worked and produced to provide *the greatest good for the greatest number* is entitled to the greatest reward. Additionally, a buy-out arrangement between worker-owners and/or the bank would quickly resolve any irreconcilable personal differences between men in the business, or facilitate a job change if desired.

Reflections

As I reflect on all I've written above, it becomes oh so crystal clear how we in America have lost our way. The destructive and death rendering consequences of our era are all around us—in our families, our health, our communities, our economic and financial systems, our jobs, our governments, our legal system, our medical bureaucracies, our educational institutions, our military-industrial {196} complex, our labor unions, our courts and in our religious institutions. We are individually and collectively bankrupt, literally caught in an accelerating death spiral. But there is hope. We are not dead yet. Our heritage is that of the greatest spiritual and economic freedom the world has ever seen, given to us by God-

fearing, self-governing men. And we now have with Mondragon the abstract and concrete solutions. We have the spiritual and economic answers necessary to put our national house back into order. Furthermore, we have the technology necessary to achieve these desirable ends. The only question is whether we have the faith, the individual and national character, and the will to go to work to change things. If we do, then a glorious future awaits us long-term. If we do not, then we will effectively, by our sins (errors) of omission and commission, commit suicide. We shall die.

The choice is ours. The two paths available are clearly before us. One is easy short-term, but brings death long-term. This is the path we are on presently. The other path is painful short-term, but brings the abundant life long-term. We will reap what we sow. The people at Mondragon were worse off than we are now when they got started. They turned things around. Can we do any less?

The Nature of Society

Human action is never static. Anytime we're coasting, we're headed downhill. We are either building up or we are tearing down. We are either acting constructively or destructively. Destruction comes naturally.

There is nothing quite like a crisis to bring out the true character and mettle of a people. When the pressure is on, people either pull together or they tear each other apart. A people's spiritual values, the laws which stem from these religious roots, and the individual and collective behavior patterns taught and applied, determine largely whether a people will pull through together during tough times, or self-destruct.

In this sense, people reap what they sow. People cannot for long act contrary to their religious beliefs, mental perspectives, internalized laws, cultural indoctrination and habits. For when the pressure is on, most people react. They do not think.

Of course, people need to have the basic physical stamina, the calcium, enzyme, potassium, vitamin and mineral base of life, non-toxic foods and pure water in their diet if they are to have the energy to persevere. The quality of the food not only determines {197} whether the advanced (cerebrum) or primitive (limbic) brain

centers are used, but also how the immune system and the brain interact. Stress is simultaneously mental and physical. Our bodies are by-products of the earth.

Crisis is an inevitable challenge in life for individuals and their collective institutions. This is why a society must be rooted religiously, governmentally, and economically in correct perspectives if it is to survive. A crisis brings out the errors of men's ways. A society collapses when the last of its illusions are shattered.

If an individual is taught the principles of humility, empathy, responsibility and duty, a long-term view, the necessity of short-term pain for long-term gain, the importance of service before reward, and these values are worked out in time in bioregional societies, then you have an individual who can bring strength to collective society. Such an individual is in harmony with himself, God, his fellow man, and the creation. He understands the balance between love and economic self-interest, and his need to be a good steward of the earth. He is a resource, an asset to society, rather than a predator or a parasite.

A healthy society collectively will be decentralized, architecturally and structurally, applying in the agriculturally based social order the contract—the covenant. The religious, governmental and economic nature of the contract establishes true equality amid desired inequality throughout society, based upon service first, followed by self-interest. It establishes the worth of the individual and establishes unity amid diversity. Self-interest, incentive, and risk-assumption are balanced off as by-products of duty and service, human need and security. People are seen as more important than things, as ultimate resources, because people determine the use of things. Thus, people are like-minded and this unity of love is established socially.

The constitutional covenant with government works its way back to its roots in an individual, through the church (God's non-bloodline voluntary communal body), and the extended and nuclear family. With every man living effectively under his own vine and fig tree, eating primarily fresh foods which have the same magnetic charge as where he resides, blessed with pure air, soil, and water, a man has the necessary calcium, enzymes, vitamins and mineralization in his body to live in peace physically too.

Almost needless to say, none of these things characterize our society today. Therefore, reaping what we have sown, in cause and effect fashion, our society, particularly our cities, will probably not meet the challenge of the next comprehensive crisis. We shall fall. Aside from a supernatural miracle, I see no hope for revival or {198} reformation of our cities. We have maximized our being out of touch with religious, political, economic, social and ecological reality.

Early America

In early America, 90 percent of Americans owned and worked the land in a horizontal, decentralized, covenantal fashion. Today, farmers make up less than 3 percent of our population. In 1800, less than 2 percent of free Americans worked for someone else. Today, 95 percent of Americans work for someone else in a vertical hierarchy. Some 80 percent of our people live in the cities, too, and are dependent upon government in some form, shape, or fashion. Our society is built vertically. Vertical is bureaucratic and marks a dying slave state.

Debt Capitalism and Communism

Debt capitalism is Orwellian. Capitalism (savings applied) requires short-term pain for long-term gain. Savings (capital) must be accumulated from the past and in the present for investment in the future. Debt, on the other hand, involves short-term gain with no consideration for the long-term pain it brings through compound interest and slavery. Debt is a form of slavery. Debt is borrowing from the future by mortgaging the past to consume in the present. It is the antithesis of equity capitalism/free enterprise. How can our people not be in conflict personally when our basis system of economic debt capitalism is intrinsically a contradiction? They cannot.

Debt capitalism, which focuses on the radical rights of the individual, puts man in conflict with his fellow man, elevates the destructive principle of the survival of the fittest, and has led in its true evolutionary perspective to the emphasis on things rather than people. Communism, on the other hand, with its radical focus on the collective masses, with its power-enforced, top-down

bureaucracy, not only destroys the individual building blocks of society in terms of both character, initiative and the family, but, too, puts its emphasis on things rather than people (dialectic materialism). And yet where we see people are truly the earned owners of the means of production, where individual incentive is made possible through equity non-debt capitalism and service, the balance between unity amid diversity is achieved. The conflict between capitalism and communism is neutralized. {199}

Worker-Owned Businesses

Worker-owned businesses in this country do far better, especially during crisis, than other types of debt capitalistic ventures. The work of Dr. Tom Peters has confirmed this anew. Where ESOPs (employee stock ownership plans) exist, for example, businesses are more productive, more competitive, marked by higher profits, better employee morale, and less absenteeism. The business is seen as a family. The family is the basic social unit of society, one place removed from the individual, whether it is the nuclear family, the extended family, the spiritual family in the local church, the economic family in the local business, or the political family in the local community. Man's need for love, his spiritual need for family, is as high a need as his need for economic sustenance.

Why Mondragon is a Winner

The reason the experiment at Mondragon, Spain, has been successful for over four decades is because people found the correct balance between individual rights and collective society. The conflict between individualistic capitalism and collective communism was resolved at Mondragon. Individual needs were first balanced off with those of the community. Leadership was earned, was local and accountable.

The crisis of persecution brought out the best in the people at Mondragon, too. They did not self-destruct. They created a system that's a shining example for us all. America particularly needs to go to school on Mondragon.

Where else are there societies in crisis? In the Soviet Union, Sri Lanka, in parts of Asia, Africa and South America. And guess what? In these areas, too, facsimiles of Mondragon have sprung up

independently. Poland, for example, in 1940 began in investment trust which operates effectively just like the bank at Mondragon. More than 175,000 people work in Polish cooperatives. The Poles and the people in the Basque both, without knowledge of each other, set up almost identical systems. This gives us a sense of hope. Are we about to see the *hundredth monkey syndrome* manifest itself as we purge the errors of this age and the foundations of our culture are shaken? The radical individualism of debt capitalism and the radical collectivism of socialism and communism are both dying. Furthermore, their focus on things as more important than people will accelerate their death in a world caught in comprehensive crisis. {200} When things are more important than people, inevitably conflict is manifest. How do we divide the economic apple? Who decides? Conflict! But when people are more important than things, where spirit is more important than matter, there can be like-mindedness, one-mindedness, and love. Common ground is sought. This then establishes the basis for cooperation and the just and merciful division of things in collective society without destroying the initiative of the individual. The contract (law) becomes the primary instrument of love. (Such is next to impossible where the time value of money [compound interest] rules.)

Mondragon has proven that it can outperform both socialism/communism and debt capitalism. We know a people and a society by its fruits, but its works. The fruits and works of Mondragon, in terms of the spiritual, mental, physical, emotional, governmental and economic health of its people, slam dunk both fault-ridden debt capitalism and communism/socialism. Furthermore, the consistency in Mondragon between means and ends, between process and goals, is a shining light of truth which illuminates the inconsistencies and contradictions of both debt capitalism and communism/socialism. The United States is now a class structured society as the middle class has been progressively destroyed under debt capitalism. The Soviet Union, far from bringing about the classless society promised by Marxism, is the most class-structured society in the world today. Position there is not based upon merit or service. It's based upon status in the party, in the bureaucracy. The fruits of communism, therefore, confirm the error of Karl Marx. The end cannot be different from the process,

from the means, and maintain its integrity and validity long-term.

People Power

There are effectively two aspects of real power; 1) being able to act effectively to accomplish what you want; and 2) not being under the control of other people, but instead cooperating with other people. Both of these are achieved at Mondragon.

People's Express almost got it right in this country, too, with the company organized as worker-managed teams without supervisors. Low salaries but generous profit-sharing plans and stock dividends provided for both individual incentives and group cooperation.

When a corporation decides to enter a new product market, it is coming close to duplicating Mondragon. The corporation already has established its primary investment in people, in its management, staff {201} and workers. Capital, accounting, marketing and feedback systems already exist. So, "*pick a product.*" People are more important than things.

The May 1987 issue of *Inc.* magazine, in an article entitled, "Every Worker An Owner?," pointed out the advantages of ESOPs. This is as close as we've come in the United States to the successful experience achieved at Mondragon. This *Inc.* magazine article documented that companies with high degrees of employee-ownership out-perform similar-size competitors. They also grow faster than they were growing previously.

Knowledge of how to run ESOPs and other worker-owned collectives in this country is widespread, but it is so contrary to cultural norms that those ESOPs established are few and far between. It will take a crisis to establish them.

The Trammell Crow Company, for which I worked over a decade ago, caught a glimpse of the *business people principle* in its early years. It became the largest real estate development company in the country partly because it provided its bottom line leasing agents and staff personnel with the individual incentive of *owning a piece of the action* of the projects developed. Local partner power established a check and balance with the central Dallas office. Entrepreneurs primarily were hired. Real estate development, after all, is an entrepreneurial business.

Mondragon's Organization Structure

What are some of the specifics, the technicalities incorporated at Mondragon, which have made it successful? Each division of 20 to 50 worker-owners conducts at least a monthly Work Group meeting to discuss any and all issues. Management and their Social Council representatives are part of the Group. This 20 to 50 numerical division is important. Studies in large churches in the United States have indicated that most people never get to know more than 20 to 50 members of any congregation. The more successful churches have thus divided up their larger churches into these smaller numerical units.

At Mondragon, each worker-owner 20-to-50-member Group elects a representative. This representative then meets with all the other representatives of the worker-owner businesses in the Social Council. The ruling Board has delegated to the Social Council all the worker issues with which unions are normally concerned—salaries, {202} safety, fringe benefits, job descriptions, etc. Furthermore, the Social Council is responsible for deciding to which charities 10 percent of the annual company profits will go (a tithe).

Every worker-owner can be involved in managing every aspect of the business. All worker-owners have one share of voting stock. Therefore, they all have equal power. Management and labor are distinctive, but both of them fall under the umbrella of the cooperative, and both are subservient to the Board. This assures total integration and coordination. If the Board, for some reason, should fail in its task, then the General Assembly of all worker-owners, which wields the ultimate power within the cooperative, can overrule the Board. This results in total accountability at all levels. A member of the Group who has also been elected to the Board may also participate when it comes to the more mundane worker-owner matters.

Each cooperative (worker-owned business) elects representatives to the Association of Cooperatives. This Association elects the Board of the secondary cooperatives which include the Bank at Mondragon, the Research Institute, and the Insurance and Social Security institutions. However, the main focus of the Association of Mondragon Cooperatives is to create worker-owner jobs. This

primary business/service thrust of the Association of Cooperatives enhances current worker-owner job security and gives the current worker-owners an incentive to be enthusiastic about automation. The worker-owners are equity capitalists. For this reason then, the cooperatives at Mondragon have moved aggressively forward in robot development. The worker-owners realize that their jobs are not threatened by automation and progress, and that new jobs are being created in which they have a stake. And so, the worker-owners enthusiastically embrace computerized automation which eliminates repetitive jobs, dirty jobs, and increases the productivity and the viability of a product produced for the international marketplace.

The Positive Fallout

The worker-owners at Mondragon can be progressive and embrace change, even if it eliminates their own particular job, because they own the business themselves. They are not threatened. New jobs are being created for them, and as a member of the Mondragon cooperative, having a job is guaranteed for life.

The civil government has no involvement in this process. No worker-owner in the Mondragon cooperative is ever dependent upon {203} public assistance. The purpose of the cooperatives is to contribute to the needs and development of society, which means the health and welfare of the individuals within the cooperative society. Beautifully then, each worker-owner in the Mondragon cooperative has the incentive to provide for himself and simultaneously serve society. It is unity amid diversity personified. It is social harmony. It is the balance between the one and the many. It is the balanced trade-off between individual and collective rights.

Individual Benefits

What do the Mondragon cooperatives do with their profits from their businesses? Presently, 70 percent of the profits are distributed among the worker-owners. This distribution is based upon an earned salary scale, as well as the number of years an individual has been involved with the cooperative. Thus, individual productivity is balanced off with time commitment to economic society in the

profit distributions.

Moreover, the profits are not cash distributions. They are instead allocated to the worker-owner's internal capital account, where they are regarded as a loan by the worker to the cooperative. Therefore, the worker-owner becomes an investor, an equity capitalist, by the way of investment in both his own business and the community-at-large.

The worker receives dividends each year in cash just before Christmas. An interest rate of 6 percent is paid annually on his internal account. As the worker-owner's investment in a cooperative increases, the cooperative re-invests his profits to create more worker-owned jobs, more profits, more dividends, and more job and financial security for the worker-owner. This methodology is very important. It allows newly formed cooperatives to receive uncollateralized capital at low interest rates. In the West, this start-up capital is normally the most difficult and expensive capital to borrow, and primarily the cause of failure for most new businesses—lack of sufficient capital! Mondragon has solved this basic problem!

What happens if the cooperative for one reason or another ceases to exist? The remaining amount of funds, which is collectively owned, is given to charity and managed for the general welfare. There is therefore no owner or banking incentive at Mondragon to arbitrarily bankrupt businesses, to go out of business, or to cash out of a business which is profitably providing a needed social good or service. Only those businesses which really have no hope and {204} should be liquidated are in fact liquidated.

The worker-owner does have use of this portion of his 70 percent of the profits if he needs it. This 70 percent capital account can be used as collateral at the bank for a personal loan. On this personal loan, the interest rate which is charged the worker-owner is only percent or 2 percent above the 6 percent which he is earning via the cooperatives' use of his capital in the new job creation process.

The Full Life at Mondragon

Compare and contrast what the Mondragon worker has going for him by way of a rich personal, social and productive, profitable, economic life, to that of his American counterpart.

The Mondragon worker-owner has job security, tenure, financial security, a say in all aspects of his business where he is a worker-owner, a voice financially and personally in community affairs, a sense of belonging, and the incentive to be progressive, creative, and productive. He experiences the excitement of personal involvement with his own (and the community's bank), research institute, insurance program and social security system. He is an investor, consumer, an important individual with dignity, and yet at the same time, he is encompassed by a strong sense of belonging as a significant, loving member of the community.

When we see what has been accomplished and proven at Mondragon, Spain, for over 40 years by way of the answers necessary to meet both the love and money needs of man, the answers which already exist with regard to meeting individually and collectively man's biological, safety, social, egotistical and self-fulfillment needs, and then compare it to what exists in this country today, it's enough to bring tears to our eyes.

Lessons For America

We Americans are a proud, stubborn people. We are devoid of love, as we war with one another over everything, filing 96 percent of the civil lawsuits in the world. "*Who do you know in Idaho? Does anyone there know you? Who do you know who lives next door, or is he a stranger too?*" (Killough & Eckley).

We are dead spiritually. We declared some twenty years ago that "*God is dead.*" We are impoverished economically. Everything we own today is in hock, in debt. The root meaning of the word "*debt*" is "*death,*" just as the word "*mortgage*" comes from the French word {205} "*Mort,*" meaning "*death.*"

We are dead physically as we eat lifeless stale foods produced from poisoned air, soil and water. We live in dead cities of glass, concrete, asphalt and steel, and thereby miss the life-giving diamagnetic charge so necessary for our peace and tranquility, which is provided only by the trees and plants of God's Good Earth.

The colors blue and green, which are so vibrant in a decentralized "*vine and fig tree*" agricultural economy, are vital to our spiritual and physical health as their wavelengths impact and nourish our

pineal and pituitary glands respectively. All this is missed in the cities, the heart of our civilization.

Spengler was correct. Our civilization peaked 90 years ago with the rise of world cities. City-produced chemicals have brought rampant toxicity to the countryside and our farmers are now, too, poisoned. Undertakers tell us it takes a third less embalming fluid to preserve us. We are therefore already one-third dead. We only await our total burial.

Seen in this light, the American fitness craze, the emphasis on *looking good*, is a sad, cruel joke. What we need is radical surgery on our hearts (figuratively speaking) to begin with. We need a spiritual, mental, physical, emotional, individual and collective renewal. But, such seems not about to come until we suffer much pain, until the system comes crashing down on our heads, until our cities die. And the sun of that sad date is about to dawn. For the sun of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control has long ago set and departed from the American urban spirit.

Summary: The Tyranny of the Time Value of Money

As we have seen, people are more important than things because people create, use and destroy things. Furthermore, when people are treated as more important than things, there is harmony and cooperation in society. What follows is more voluntary sharing, justice and give-and-take concerning things. This cooperation, covenanting and contracting in turn creates more prosperity, more things. So prosperity long-term for any society rests upon having its priorities straight, placing its primary emphasis on people rather than things (and money).

This emphasis on people rather than things (and money) is the essence of why the Bank of the People's Labor at Mondragon, Spain, has been so successful long-term. No business failures. No loan failures. Top productivity in all of Spain, highest profitability (nearly double that of its competitors), highest moral and innovative ratings possible—all characterize Mondragon. Success there has been achieved in all areas. Success is a by-product of doing things correctly. Ideas have consequences.

Critical to the success at Mondragon, although unstated and

possibly unrecognized even by these people, is that they have established their priorities on people systems and effectively checkmated the natural inclination to focus on the time value of money with its compounding effect. The compounding of money in a fractional reserve, debt-based, interest sensitive society inevitably leads to a focus on things (and money) rather than people. The reason for this is because the challenge of compounding is a challenge which no individual or society can meet or beat long-term. The compounding of interest, money earning money on money, is relentless, ruthless, eternal, mistake free and eventually exponential. By contrast, men make mistakes, need rest, do not forecast the future perfectly, make poor use of human and natural resources, and are fortunate if they can simply achieve arithmetic economic growth. Therefore, it is no surprise that the slave-making god of debt money and compound interest eventually forces all to bow at its altar. With people thus forced to serve this god of money (mammon), money (and things) then inescapably become more important than people.

The key chapter in my book, *No Time for Slaves*, chapter 3, is entitled “No Time for Slaves.” Therein I discuss the dangers and pitfalls of debt slavery. Human nature has not changed. We should hail back to the sound advice given us by the Hebrews of the Old Testament, the Greeks, the great Christian teachers of the Middle Ages, and the Founding Fathers who built this country. These wise men outlawed fractional reserve debt money, compound interest, usury and paper money. They spurned debt generally. They found reprehensible the concept of money earning money on money—compound interest. And they were prosperous.

The bottom line is this. If a people in a society are to be prosperous, peaceful and happy long-term, the economic structure of society must establish people as superior to things (and money). This is the lesson of Mondragon. But in order for this to occur, a society must establish the rules (boundaries) of monetary law. Such monetary law must first and foremost include prohibition of fractional reserve debt money, paper money, and the compound interest factor, whereby money earns money by simply being money. Strict {207} limitations on the nature and length of debt itself are also important. Such prohibitions forbid non-productive financial activities, such as we have seen run rampant in recent

years by way of junk bonds used for leveraged buy-outs, mergers, greenmail, and the weakening, dismantling and sell-off of productive business corporations. Such prohibitions are the only way to establish the correct priority of people over things.

If people are indeed primarily spiritual beings, made in the image of God, then they are eternal. Therefore, people are more important than things (and money), which are temporal. Therefore, the very concept of the time value of money as eternal is a myth, as debt-based society after debt-based society has demonstrated time and time again down through history. These societies have crumbled and disappeared. When a society focuses on the time value of money and such things as discounted present value, as our social order so totally does today, it has bought the lie of money as god. It has elevated money and things to a more important position than people. It has relinquished its freedom and prosperity in exchange for a walk on the ever increasing angle of inclination, on the treadmill of compound interest, to exhaustion. To hold as absolute the concept that life is time and time is money, is to equate life with money. Then money and things become more important than people and the society begins to die. For when money and things become more important than people, conflict over money and things accelerates. Conflict brings about poverty, not prosperity. The result long-term is less things for people. So, unless there are laws which establish money as a commodity, or as the representative thereof, unless there are laws which tie money to man's real, finite world, there's no hope for establishing cooperation over conflict, for establishing people are more important than things, or for escaping the long-term exhaustion and bankruptcy resulting from the tyranny of the time value of money.

I would be remiss if I did not mention that as a byproduct of establishing the time value of money (and things) as superior to people, that people, particularly children, become a curse rather than a blessing. Children are expensive. They are sacrificed to the god of debt service. So, it is no accident that with the increasing debt load in a society there is a concomitant increase in abortion.

A people who do not reproduce themselves and murder their young by definition commit suicide long-term. Thus, the time value of money which establishes the priority of money (and things) over people inescapably destroys mankind.

“POVERTY” AND SPIRITUALITY

An Examination of Biblical Categories

J. Daryl Charles

Introduction

In assessing the vast array of current “poverty” literature which fills the racks of many a Christian bookstore, not to mention the theologies of “the poor” which are being advanced at most seminaries, one is struck by a conspicuous ideology which seems to undergird most theses being set forth. Christians should be on the side of the poor, the weak and the oppressed, it is invariably maintained.¹ While it will not be our aim to question whether Christians should or should not be “on the side of the poor,” it is incumbent upon the Christian community to consider seriously the biblical notions which identify the character of “the poor” in Scripture. This is particularly important given the human propensity for prancing through the Old Testament and New Testament in search of corroborating proof-texts which seem to lend credence to our cherished agendas.

Several fundamental errors seem to appear repeatedly when Christian theorists begin delineating strategies for compassion

1. One thinks immediately, for example, of the popular essay of several years ago written by Ronald Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1977), which prompted a response by David Chilton entitled *Productive Christians in an Age of Guilt Manipulation* (Tyler, TX: ICE, 1981). It is understandable and indeed reasonable that Christians attempt—even via the well-intentioned though somewhat misinformed economics and theology of people such as Sider—to rectify what are considered to be traditional deficiencies in the church’s posture, be they doctrinal or ethical. A cursory review of the history of the Christian church reflects the constant ‘pendulum’ phenomenon. In reaction to excess or lack, men swing to the opposite extreme. The question is whether a new breed of heresy emerges to replace the old.

toward the poor, whether at home or in Third World cultures. Almost {210} without fail, the poor or oppressed are defined exclusively in material or economic terms.² This tendency, however, is not confined merely to circles of “radical Christians.” It is a constant war-cry of the media-and intellectual-elite and plays nicely into the hands of those who covet what the “First” and “Second” Worlds have amassed. However, dividing the world into “thirds” is not our present focus. In His earthly ministry, Jesus did not give Himself—nor did His disciples—to the rebuilding of Jerusalem’s slums. We are not by any means suggesting that Jesus was indifferent to social need. However, this was not His *focus*. To only perform a face-lift on the exterior of human need, the root of which was and still remains rebellion, alienation from God, and the necessity of forgiveness, is to miss the heart of Jesus’ redemptive mission in history. Furthermore, new housing projects and food-for-the-hungry programs would have been necessary within another ten years of His ascension.

A second tendency is to place the representation of the cause of the poor on the ideological left of the political spectrum. Yet, this is no new thing; it occurred, for example, in mid-nineteenth century France, where the French Left represented the poor of its populations, most of whom were victims. It is significant that when the truly disenfranchised could not constitute what was in Marx’s eyes a “revolutionary force,” they became to him the “proletariat scum.” So much for Marx’s compassion and representation of the poor. In actuality, the poor, as described in merely *sociological* terms, can be found on the left or the right of the political spectrum. Abuse of power, injustice and inequality know no ideological immunity.

Yet another fallacy is found in the attempt to equate “the poor” with “the working class.”³ Today the left places the Third World

2. The difficulty in restricting ‘poverty’ to *material* means is reflected in trying to define the term itself. By whose standards? In what culture? By what measure? Any review of U.S. Bureau of Labor statistics would show that poverty ‘minimums’ are constantly being upgraded. One economist has concluded that ‘poverty’ is merely a function of ideology (see I. Kristol, *Two Cheers for Capitalism* [New York: Basic, 1978], 217).

3. A point treated at some length by Jacques Ellul, in *The Ethics of Freedom* (tr. G.W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 374–76.

where the proletariat used to be.⁴ Yet, the left neither represents nor helps the Third World effectively. Do the machines for revolutionist propaganda in truth serve or exploit the poor?⁵ It has been observed that in the early 1930s, the “poor workers” of Germany were part of the Nazi Party.⁶ Can one then argue that Christians should have supported Hitler’s agenda—which the church unwittingly did in the main—since God is “always” on the side of the poor?

In truth, there exists no party, no demagogue, which purely represents “the poor and oppressed.” Hence, such a political agenda *cannot* be erected on *Christian grounds*. Jacques Ellul⁷ reminds us of the fallacy of the Christian seeking to find *theological justification* for a chosen position regarding his political opinions. That is, there are no inherently Christian reasons *based on revelation* through Scripture which defend one form of order, government, hierarchy or {211} political process.⁸ The fact is that all men are influenced by their interests, prejudices, education, environment, and political knowledge.⁹ Rather, Christians engage in the political sphere, just as in every other life sphere, for one ultimate purpose: to “gospelize,” i.e., to bear witness to Christ the Lord. To be sure, this is the movement of the book of Acts as it portrays the early church. One of the tragedies of the history of the Christian church is that she has managed again and again to nationalize, socialize, economize and politicize the *evangelion*. However, the authentic Christian presence in the world means to confess Christ before men, to announce reconciliation. Never should the eternal, the ultimate, the absolute, be subsumed under the provisional, the penultimate, the relative.

4. See Ellul, 376.

5. Ellul (p. 376) points to the aid alone which is given by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., the difference being one-hundred-fold.

6. Ellul, 377.

7. Ellul, 375–76.

8. Notwithstanding, it is legitimate to pray and intercede, based on 1 Timothy 2:1–7, that the existing order be sufficiently influenced by the Sovereign Lord for the purpose of perpetuating the Gospel of Christ among men.

9. Thus Ellul, 377.

“Radical” Christians

By the very message and commission he bears in the world, the Christian depoliticizes or “demythologizes” the realm of the political. That is to say, it is stripped of its ideological sway over men.¹⁰ Inherent to the political sphere is contact with power, and the laws of the Kingdom of God stand diametrically opposed to the implementation of that power *when* it is seen as a vehicle for *disseminating Christian presence* in the world (cf. Mark 10:42–44)¹¹ The church’s mission is to proclaim, not to govern.

A very interesting phenomenon of the modern church is to note the virtual absence of the term “martyrdom.”¹² “Radical” Christians today prefer rather to speak in political terms. Their rhetoric tends to focus on the issues of political “violence” and “the oppressed.”¹³ In reality, what many are doing is simply veiling their hatred and envy¹⁴ of those possessing power, wealth or largess by an ideological identification with “the poor.”¹⁵ German sociologist Max Scheler has described this form of resentment disguised in a feigned love for the “small” or “weak”:

10. Ellul, 384.

11. Charles Colson has served as a prophetic and poignant reminder to the Body of Christ of the delusions of secular power. See his *Who Speaks for God?* (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1985), and *Kingdoms in Conflict* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987). It is noteworthy that the Yale historian Jaroslav Pelikan, in *From Luther to Kierkegaard* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1950), 35–36, considers the four-hundred years of German Lutheranism following Luther to be most accurately described as Melancthonism, not Lutheranism. Many professors of theology in Germany at the turn of the twentieth century espoused a view of the state which reflected Melancthon’s dependence on Aristotelian philosophy . since men, due to natural law, congregate in societies, order constitutes the crown of any society. The state thus achieves a near divine status. Melancthon helped facilitate a wedding of the throne with the altar in Germany.

12. See Ellul’s comments on this point (393–98).

13. The tendency to fuse Christian language with revolutionary concepts is not new. History is strewn with political movements - of greater and lesser import - which maintained some type of vestigial identification with Christianity.

14. A vastly neglected sphere in the whole “poverty” debate, within or without Christian circles, is the role which *envy* and *covetousness* play in the “redistribution” of material or economic wealth. “You shall not covet” rings strangely unfamiliar in all the modern hype concerning “the poor.”

15. For an excellent treatment of how the issues of poverty, humanitarianism, egalitarianism, guilt manipulation, dependency and power intersect, see Herbert Schlossberg, *Idols for Destruction*, (Nashville, TN: Nelson, 1983), 49–82.

When hatred does not dare to come out into the open it can be easily expressed in the form of ostensible love—love for something which has features that are the opposite of those of the hated object. This can happen in such a way that the hatred remains secret.¹⁶

It is significant that one of Jesus' disciples sought to emanate concern for the poor when costly spikenard was being used by Mary to anoint Jesus in an act of worship (John 12). "Why was this {212} ointment not sold for 300 denarii and given to the poor?" (v. 5). A bit of needed editorial work follows. The Evangelist adds, "He said this not because he was concerned for the poor..." The feigned love of the poor can achieve the effect of ascribing virtue to the *condition* of sickness or poverty in and of itself. This is, however, vastly divergent from genuine Christian love which sees the *person* without elevating the status of his or her sociological condition.¹⁷ Theoretically, the true Marxist is incapable of becoming a martyr. Contrarily, the committed Christian, who does not ultimately resort to the political as a means of transforming society, can choose to lay down his life.¹⁸ For the disciple of Christ, there exists something higher in life than political change. Indeed, martyrdom affirms that God is sovereign, that men answer to a higher authority.¹⁹ Where then in the popular dialogue concerning the poor does the rule of God and His claims over men fit in? The OT and NT are not silent regarding this issue. Unfortunately, very few whose books on poverty are selling like hotcakes have been willing to examine the constitution of "the poor" as defined in Scripture.

16. M. Scheler, *Ressentiment* (tr. W. Holdheim, Glencoe, IL: Free, 1961), 96.

17. Schlossberg does an admirable job of disentangling this twisted line of thinking. A 'Robin Hood' theology, favored by many 'radical' Christians, is as much a sin against God as a rich man's exploitation of the poor. Theft is theft, and not charity. Furthermore, how many social and economic theorists first seek to mitigate the effects of poverty by acknowledging the role of the *family* unit? In American cities, that would first of all translate into addressing the issue of *single-parent* families, to name one example.

18. In this sense, being "Christian" and "Marxist" is a contradiction.

19. Ellul, 393.

A Closer Look at “The Poor”

The “Poor of Yahweh” in the Old Testament

As a social phenomenon, there are many references to poverty in the OT. Three essential lines of thought regarding the poor are reflected in the OT as a whole.²⁰ A most conspicuous attitude toward poverty is that it was held to be scandalous, a contradiction of Israel’s corporate solidarity and covenant blessing at the hands of Yahweh (cf. Deuteronomy 15:11). Thus, the prophets would rebuke the pride and social dislocation which arose from mistreatment of the poor (e.g., Hosea 12:8; Amos 8:5; Micah 2:1–3; Jeremiah 22:13–17; Ezekiel 22:29). Although both rich and poor were attacked by the prophets (cf. Jer. 5:28 and 5:4), disregard for the latter constituted an affront to Yahweh’s sovereignty (Isa. 3:14–15). Israel’s profession, through much of its history, was that of temporal retribution. Reward comes with righteousness.

A second and contrasting attitude toward poverty comes to expression in the book of Proverbs. One finds not only the above-mentioned sapiential stereotype of riches as blessing (e.g., 6:10–11; 10:4; 20:13; 23:21; 24:34; 28:19), but also riches as accrued through wickedness (e.g., 16:19; 19:1, 22; 28:6). According to this second stereotype, it could be asserted that God is *opposed* to the {213} *poor*, i.e., those who are indolent or insufficiently motivated (Prov. 6:6–11; 10:25; 11:24–26; 13:4; 18:11; 19:15; 20:13; 21:25; 24:30–34; 28:19; 30:24–28). This lack of motivation might be reflected vertically in one’s independence from God and horizontally in failing to supply for the needs of others.²¹

Thirdly, wisdom also knows an ideal intermediate state in which

20. Discussion found in A. Gelin, *The Poor of Yahweh*, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1964), 15ff, is most helpful here.

21. Hence, Christians need to be more judicious in making the assertion that “God is on the side of the poor.” To the contrary, He is impartial (*Matt. 5:45; Acts 10:34–35; James 1:5; 2:1*) and is even against “the poor” if they disregard His ways. Consider Prov. 6:30–31, a prescription for one stealing food in order to eat. If caught, he is to make a seven-fold restitution. What God *does* oppose is the *mistreatment* of the poor. Groups such as the fatherless, widows and aliens represent categories which, in biblical terms, constitute the *truly* dispossessed, and hence, require particular care.

neither poverty nor riches are ascribed a virtue (e.g., Prov. 30:8–9).²²

The Terminology of Poverty in the Old Testament

Normally, four terms convey the OT sense of a “poor man”: ebyôn,²³ dal,²⁴ ānî,²⁵ and rāš.²⁶ Poverty vocabulary is illustrated by the prophet Amos,

...they sold the righteous man (saddiq) for silver and the poor man (ebyôn) for a pair of shoes. They bruise the heads of the poor (dallîm) upon the dust of the earth and turn aside the way of the humble (anāwîm).²⁷

and the writer of the eighty-second Psalm,

Defend the lowly (dal) and the fatherless; render justice to the afflicted (ānî) and the destitute (rāš). Rescue the lowly (dal) and the poor (ebyôn); from the hand of the wicked deliver them.²⁸

Normally, the “poor” in the Psalms (frequently the “anāwîm”) are the “offering” of the “enemies.” Their poverty is their sense of *threat*; hence, they are weak and defenseless. Their response is that they flee to *Yahweh*, not to man. One is “poor” or “oppressed” in relationship to provocation from an enemy or oppressor.

22. This would seem to agree with the view of the material realm as evidenced by both Jesus and Paul.

23. The term ebyôn proceeds from the root ābāh (‘to wish,’ ‘to desire’ or ‘to lack’), with an equivalent in Ugaritic and ancient Egyptian, and indicates expectation, as of a pauper. ebyôn signifies foremost the misery of a social condition, but becomes transposed onto a spiritual plane in the OT. See Humbert, “Le mot biblique ‘ebyôn,’” *RHPR* 32 (1952) 1–6, also G.J. Botterweck, “ebyôn,” *TDOT*, 1:27–41. In the individual Psalms of lament, ebyôn often appears with anāwîm, “the poor.”

24. The root dālal (“to be thin, weak or sick”) expresses the idea of becoming poor or miserable. See H.J. Fabry, “dal,” *TDOT*, 3:208–30. Not the seven dallôt cows in Pharaoh’s dream (*Genesis 41:19*).

25. From the root ā nā h, originally meaning “to stoop or bow down,” ā nî suggests suffering, and specifically, *external* oppression. This word, distributed fairly evenly throughout the Torah, the prophets and the hagiographa, acquires a distinctly religious signification in the OT and intertestamental literature.

26. This is a neutral term and occurs frequently in Proverbs. Two other Hebrew terms, *rēq* and *miskēn*, belong to the total OT vocabulary of poverty.

27. Amos 2:6–7.

28. Psalm 82:3–4.

However, the expectation of *divine* deliverance—not political or economic—is a trait of the “anāwîm.” A. Kuschke²⁹ underscores the legal claim which belonged to the “anāwîm”; they possessed the rights of covenant members. Thus, the “anāwîm” are those who seek Yahweh, wait on Him, and declare themselves to be His servants.³⁰

The Spirituality of the Poor

According to Walter Eichrodt,³¹ the Bible’s center of gravity is the theology of covenant. As Yahweh’s first-born (békôr, Exodus 4:22), {214} Israel is the first-fruit (rēšît) of the nations (Jer. 2:3). Yahweh and Israel are wed together (Isa. 50:1; Hos. 2:21–22; Jer. 2:2; Ezek. 23). As the prophets had clearly enunciated, the privilege of covenant carried sobering responsibilities. Unlike the Assyrian captivity, the Babylonian exile would in many ways mark the beginnings of a spiritual restoration. The exile itself would further the equation of “the people of Yahweh” with “the poor.” Zephaniah, prophesying on the verge of Judah’s captivity (640–630 BC), identified the future people as “the poor”:

Seek Yahweh, all you meek (anāwîm) of the earth, you that wrought his judgment; seek righteousness, seek humility (anāwāh)...(2:3).

The prophet further announces that Yahweh would remove the pride from among His people and have as a remnant a poor and afflicted people who would trust in His name:

In that day...I will take away from your midst those who rejoice in your pride, and you will no longer be haughty because of my holy mountain. But I will leave in your midst an afflicted (ānî) and poor (dal) people, and they will trust in the name of the Lord (3:11–12).

Prophesying a century before Zephaniah, Isaiah predicted the remnant in essentially the same terms:

Now this is the man to whom I will look, to the one who is humble (ānî) and contrite in spirit, who trembles at my word (66:2).

29. “Arm und Reich im Alten Testament,” ZAW 57 (1937) 50.

30. Note the posture of the poor man in Psalm 123:2.

31. *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; tr. J.A. Baker, London: SCM, 1961–1967).

Through this picture of openness, we perceive the divine purpose of the exile experience. It was to serve as a vehicle for bringing about an absolute humility and ready obedience.³²

OT Types of “the Poor Man”

The reader of the OT is struck by the condition of “the poor man” particularly in the Psalms. Not infrequently do words such as “distress,” “calamity,” and “misfortune” appear in the Psalmist’s lament over varying degrees of injustice. Psalm 22 vividly mirrors the poor man’s affliction, chastisement, scorn and despairing for life. Much of Psalm 69 depicts the anguish of imprisonment of the “anāwîm,” out {215} of which a plea for deliverance arises. In Psalm 37, the wicked schemes against the “anāwîm” with evil devices, gnashing as it were with his teeth, readying the sword and bow in order to slay the poor man. In this Psalm, the “poor” are specifically. “Those who hope in Yahweh” (v. 9), the righteous (v. 17), the innocent (v. 18), those “blessed by Yahweh” (v. 22), His “holy ones” (v. 28), the peaceful (v. 37), and “those who trust in Yahweh” (v. 40). “Poverty” in this Psalm, as in others,³³ is no mere sociological status, as contrived by the modern mind. Rather, the “anāwîm” are *Yahweh’s own* who are poised to do His will. In Psalm 69:37, they are called His “servants.”

Thus, the “anāwîm” as portrayed in the Psalter are the fervent, sincere and obedient ones, those who keep covenant. Here “anāwîm” assumes an almost technical sense and frequently appears in the context of provocation at the hands of an enemy.

The prophet Jeremiah, whom Yahweh called to suffer, is also a type of the “anāwîm.” In 20:13, he is “the poor man” (ebyôn). The audience to which he is called is intractable, and none stand by his side. His utterances are intermittent cries of distress and affirmations of faith. Jeremiah anguishes over his own sufferings as well as those of Israel (note, for example, Lamentations 3:19–20 and 40–54).

Job might also be viewed as a predecessor to the “anāwîm,”

32. Consider Psalm 137, a post-exilic reflection on the part of the remnant.

33. Note the description of the anāwîm, for example, in Psalm 18:28; 35:10; 69:30, 33; 76:10; 86:1–2; 140:13; and 149:4.

though in contrast a more “colorful”³⁴ figure than Jeremiah. After his bout with the three friends, the Elihu speeches, and God’s speech, Job is silent, contrite and humbled. His testimony (42:2–6) is reminiscent of the Psalmist’s confession. “Before I was afflicted, I went astray” (Psalm 119:67).

The suffering types of Job and Jeremiah, however, are not isolated cases of “the poor man.” It is noteworthy that Moses, the man of God, should be known for one particular feature. It is written that he was an exceedingly “humble” (ānāw) man (Numbers 12:3). Not insignificantly, the descendant of David would also be characterized as “humble” (anî), much in contrast to standard military lords (Zechariah 9:9, cf. Matthew 21:5 and John 12:15). And twice the Isaianic “Servant” is described in terms of poverty (ānāh) (53:4, 7). What is striking about the “servant” is the notion of suffering and redemptive sacrifice with which he is associated. As the “poor man” in the Psalms, the “Servant” in Isaiah achieves virtual eschatological stature.

By the second century BC, the transformation of “anāwāh,” “poverty” or “humility,” into a religious virtue was full. Jesus ben Sirach writes: “My son, with humility (anāwāh) have self-esteem” (Sirach 10:27).³⁵ The same virtue is known in rabbinic literature as well. A {216} tradition among the rabbis ascribed three qualities to the “disciples of Abraham” who stood over against the “disciples of Balaam.” These consisted of a good eye, a lowly mind, and a humble soul.³⁶ According to the Talmud, a heavenly voice (bāt kôl) was heard on two separate occasions which declared that the *Shekinah*, the Divine Presence, should rest upon Hillel, whose school of disciples would dominate rabbinic authority after AD 70. Upon his death, Hillel was called by the sages “the disciple of Ezra,” the pious man (Hāsīd) and “the humble man” (Ānāw).³⁷ Significantly, references to the “Hāsīdīm” and the “Ānāwīm” appear frequently in QL, particularly in the Manual of Discipline.

34. Gelin, 48.

35. For further discussion of Yahweh’s ‘poor’ in the Judaism of the last three centuries BC, see Gelin, 62–74.

36. Abot 5.19 (cited in *Mishnayoth*, vol. IV. *Order Nazikim* [Gateshead: Judaica, 1977] 536).

37. On Talmudic allusions, see comment by H. Falk in *Jesus the Pharisee: A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus* (New York-Mahwah: Paulist, 1985), 43–44.

In sum, the “poor” of Israel become the people of God. It is these who are waiting and faithful. Their hope and expectation is in the Lord, not in the arm of man. It is against this background—one of humility and religious virtue—that “poverty” in the NT is framed.

“Poverty” in the New Testament

The Magnificat in Luke’s Gospel (1:46–55) has been called Mary’s song of poverty.³⁸ Mary is one of several characters who are portrayed by Luke as humble, seeking, God-fearing Jews. Among these are Zechariah, Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna (Luke 1–2). Simeon (2:25–35) is described as a righteous and devout (*eulabēs*) man, one filled with the Holy Spirit, who was awaiting Israel’s consolation. To him it was revealed that he would see Messiah before dying. The prophetess Anna (2:36–38) in her later years was given to constant prayer at the temple and fasting. To her also was granted revelation of coming salvation to true Israel.

Mary, as Simeon and Anna, embodies the “*anāwīm*,” the poor in spirit who wait on the Lord. Part of her confession is that the Lord has regarded, and rewarded, her seeking. She is one of Yahweh’s choice servants.

...he has regarded the lowliness (*tapeinōsis*) of his handmaid. For behold from this time on all generations will call me blessed (*v. 48*)...*he* has filled the hungry...and the rich he has sent away. He has given help to Israel his servant... (*vv. 53–54*).

Is Mary’s “*tapeinōsis*” a misery of human sociological conditions or a reverent humility? We would argue the latter. Mary continues in the line of the religious devout, the *anāwīm*.” {217}

The connecting link between the Magnificat and Jesus’ “Sermon on the Mount” has largely gone unnoticed.³⁹ Jesus’ teaching is not a contradiction of the Old Testament, rather an expounding of internal dimensions of OT revelation. His first recorded law of the Kingdom is requisite for any further understanding of the Kingdom and would have been readily grasped by any God-fearing Jew. “Blessed are the poor in spirit (*hoi ptōchoi tō pneumatī*, Matt. 5:3; *hoi ptōchoi*, Luke 6:20). The difference between Matthew

38. See Gelin, 91.

39. A. Gelin (p. 98) is one of the few who has suggested a connection.

(“poor in spirit”) and Luke (“poor”) may be best explained in light of the redactive interests of each. Matthew’s concern is OT law; Luke’s is human need (note, for example, 3:11–14 and 4:17–19). The semantic range of Jesus’ choice of words here, assuming He spoke in Aramaic, would have made both versions virtually the same in meaning and readily understood.

The list of “beatitudes” should in no way be construed as some sociological manifesto. These traits, relating to the Kingdom of Heaven, are eminently spiritual; they are heart attitudes. Whoever does not enter the Kingdom as a little child does not enter in (Mark 10:15). As to Jesus’ view of the material realm in general, He would appear to consider it to be neutral. We do not find Him condemning wealth as such (cf. Luke 8:2–3; 19:1–10; John 2:1–11; 12:5).

In that much of the NT material is owing to the Apostle Paul, we would benefit from examining his posture on being “poor,” whether materially or spiritually. His own personal confession was that he was content with little or much (Philippians 4:11–12). Based on Acts as well as the Pauline corpus, it would seem that his persecution and affliction were not primarily material (1 Corinthians 4:11–12; 2 Cor. 1:9–27; Phil. 4:11–14). On numerous occasions, Paul had access to financial means (Acts 21:23–24; 24:26; 28:30. 2 Cor. 11:8–9; Phil 1:19). Most importantly, he views Jesus as the paradigm of humility and obedience (Phil. 2:5–8): “tapeinophrosunē,” “ekenōsen,” “etapeinōsen”) and twice links humility (tapeinophrosunē) with meekness (prautēs): Colossians 3:2 and Ephesians 4:2. In Paul’s eyes, Jesus represents “the poor man” *par excellence*, since the Son emptied Himself, took on the form of a servant, humbled Himself, and became obedient to the point of death.⁴⁰

Conclusion

Having preliminarily established Christian—as opposed to non-Christian—grounds for defining “poverty,” we have noted the character of the “poor man” as it appears in OT literature and is carried over into the Christian era. Already in the OT, one becomes {218} aware that a distinctly religious signification is

40. Phil. 2:6–8.

attached to “the poor.” Whether embodied in a figure like Job, the weeping prophet Jeremiah, the “Servant of Yahweh” in Isaiah, or the afflicted man in the Psalms, the poor and afflicted recognize that deliverance comes from the Lord and *not* from man. It is to *God* that they cry out for help.

“Poverty” language in the OT reflects a transfer of spiritual qualities which are increasingly associated with the genuinely religious man. He is a fervent seeker of God who readily obeys. The experience of exile in Babylon would serve to help this transfer of spirituality to the vocabulary of poverty. This fundamentally religious essence to “the poor” carries over into the NT.

Spiritual poverty thus seen is a property of faith, a spiritual disposition, and not a material, sociological or political entity. While it does not rule out material poverty or social need, this is not its prime denotation. Without this spiritual understanding of poverty, material want loses all Christian significance, degenerating either into aimless privation or a distorted view of faith.⁴¹ Spiritual poverty is the cloak which Jesus wore, making Himself “of no reputation.” In so doing, He becomes the paradigm for all sons of God. We may hence speak of an “evangelical” poverty in Scripture. It bridges both Testaments and is synonymous with total humility before God.⁴²

41. R. Voillaume, *Seeds of the Desert*, (Chicago: Fides, 1955), 258.

42. The examination of the religious significance of “the poor” is not new. For a survey of related studies done in the last 100 years, see J. Van der Ploeg, “Les Pauvres D’Israel,” *OTS* 7 (1950): 236–42, and G.J. Botterweck, “ebyón,” *TDOT* 1:27–28.

5.
*GRASS ROOTS
CHANGE*

CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION

Grass Roots Change in the “Real World”

Garry J. Moes

As general knowledge of the Christian Reconstruction “movement” widens, the term is often associated with a number of “think tanks” and educational institutes which are analyzing the doctrines and principles of biblical social development. These institutions have played, and continue to play, a vital role in the generation of ideas to nourish Christians who are called and moved by the Holy Spirit to extent the dominion of Christ’s Kingdom into every sphere of life. A favorite slogan of the “movement” has been, “Ideas have consequences,” and the educational institutes of Christian Reconstruction are a key element in the first half of that equation.

The Christian Reconstruction movement, however, is anything but an ivory tower phenomenon lost in what commentator Bill Moyers has called “the world of ideas.” Across the globe, thousands, perhaps millions, of saints are working quietly on the second half of the equation. consequences in the “real world.”

In this final section of our *Symposium on Change in the Social Order*, we present a series of case histories of ordinary and extraordinary Christians who are taking personal faith and biblical understanding into their immediate spheres of influence—from local communities to the highest levels of society. This is but a tiny {222} sampling; thousands of similar stories could be told.

For these men and women, Christian Reconstruction is not just a theory, theology, philosophy or worldview, but a way of life.

John Upton, Roy Wagner, and John Quade

“We’re in no position to be arbiters of our lives,” says one such Christian, San Diego, California, film-maker John Upton whose

conversion, career and commitments exemplify the journey from principles to practice.

Because we're dead in sin, we can't be an objective player in life," says Upton. "The only objective player is God."

God's Word is the only "objective proof" that life has purpose and meaning, he says. "So the only thing that makes sense is obedience to it."

Upton, like so many who have adopted a "reconstructionist" worldview, says that the writings of Chalcedon Founder Rousas John Rushdoony led him to begin understanding for the first time that there was a connection between the Christian faith and daily living.

"The Politics of Guilt and Pity [Rushdoony's treatise on social justice] solved the problem of the two worlds I was living in—God's world and the 'real world,' " says Upton. "The tension between the two was making me miserable. One can't make good films living in that way."

The "two worlds" for Upton at that time were the world of evangelical religion and the world of his professional endeavors. The two seemed to have no connection, he says.

Upton's career began as a businessman—the operator of a wholesaling company. As he describes it, "I was very successful, but miserable." The misery stemmed from feelings of "guilt" that he was not meeting a perceived duty to be an "evangelist"—to openly, verbally and directly proclaim the Gospel of salvation.

"I thought the sole purpose of Christianity was to save people, but it was just not comfortable for me to 'witness.'"

Nagged by his guilt feelings, Upton determined to overcome them by doing good. "I decided to do something about abortion" because that, he says, was a social evil which he found particularly troubling. At first it seemed that the work of a crisis pregnancy center would be the appropriate channel for his concerns.

At about that time, he had occasion to meet singer Laurie Boone, daughter of '50s crooner Pat Boone. Laurie had a song called "No Alibis," and Upton says he "joked" at one point that the song should be made into a music video.

A music video was not exactly the result, however. Instead, the Boone-Upton encounter eventually developed into a dramatic film {223} depicting the professional-turned-personal struggles of

a female journalist confronting the issue of abortion.

Although he was a college dropout without any previous experience in or knowledge of film-making, Upton took on the production and direction of the movie which was to be called *No Alibis*. Pat Boone helped raise the money for production of that film and another dramatic documentary on alternatives to abortion, *A Better Way*.

The films, says Upton, were “extremely successful,” both in sales and acceptance, especially during a promotional tour in Great Britain, where he and his colleagues in the projects were honored by the House of Commons. In the United States, the films were featured on Public Television’s McNeil-Lehrer News Hour.

“I was hooked,” says Upton, describing the beginnings of his transformation from businessman to film-maker and his novice’s visions of future acclaim in the movie world.

The initial anti-abortion film projects brought Upton into contact with two leading Christian Reconstructionists within the film industry—award-winning cinematographer Roy H. Wagner III and well-known character actor John Quade (John Saunders), from whom he began to glean his first understanding that faith and life are connected—that the Word of God establishes Christ’s claim on every area of life and thought.

Wagner has described how that connection works in film-making with these words.

Motion pictures, like any piece of art, must express ideas if they are to have any lasting value. If motion pictures are to reflect the passion of earlier films, they must be built on the foundation of truth. The film-makers must impose a morality in order for the characters to relate to each other and resolve the conflict in the story. Films must be made by people prepared to risk everything to express valid ideas that have consequences. With these foundational truths, the film should motivate the audience into discussions, and hopefully, decisions.

The problem with any film without foundation is that it requires little. Its characters have little, if any, rock to stand upon, to make choices with, to resolve their “fate.” That is a perfectly good definition of the character that drives the modern motion picture industry. {224}

Quade’s assessment of the modern film industry is similar.

“In today’s world of art [the humanist’s bankrupt worldview and theory of communication] means a decline in his ability to successfully propagate a film or television show,” he says. On the other hand, Quade observes, the Christian film-maker, because he has a source and foundation of objective truth, “should have a far better grasp of the methods of art production and knowledge of conditions in the marketplace, than any other.”

What we are saying is, that the artisan should gather and organize all the facts he can, present them in the best way he can, and provide the best biblical interpretation of the data that he can, and then, get out of the way and let the Holy Spirit of God do the convincing.... As they say in the film business, the bottom line is, the epistemologically self-conscious artisan who is consistent in the universal application of God’s Law Word to every facet of his work, will produce a work which will be coherent and correspond to the real nature of reality because it is based upon God’s view of reality and not an abstraction. It will speak to the real needs of the real man, sin and all, in a real world and will speak to that man in the depths of his innermost being. If it meets these requirements it will have the greatest potential audience and marketplace possible. Whether it is successful or not will therefore not depend upon man, but upon God, who alone is the source of all success.”

Upton says that such insights from Wagner, Quade, and, through them, Rushdoony, “cemented for me what my life should be as a Christian.” Until then, he says, Christianity, which had been presented to him as something spiritual and separated from the world roundabout him, “never made sense to me.”

He began to see what was wrong with most religious films, especially those made by evangelicals.

“Most Christian films try to take our own world into God’s world. That’s wrong. We’re in God’s world to begin with. We just have to be obedient to God’s reality and bring that into *our* world,” he says.

The typical Christian film, says Upton, tries to get viewers to “come to Jesus.”

“It doesn’t work. That’s just another sales call, and the viewer usually recognizes this immediately. Our objective should be to show God’s reality—truth and grace—and to show through the {225} characters in the film how obedience leads to happiness and

disobedience leads to destruction,” he says.

Most modern films in the secular market avoid this approach, he says.

“There is no sin, just victimization,” he says, adding that all too often film directors and actors develop plots and characterizations designed to get viewers to hope for the triumph of some unrighteous outcome.

Occasionally, however, a film comes along which takes a godly approach in this regard. He cites the 1985, *The Trip to Bountiful*, which extols a simple virtue—faithfulness, and skillfully lures viewers into eagerly desiring the success of the character exhibiting that virtue.

“We want our viewers to pull for righteousness. We can portray evil as it is, but we should have the viewer wanting righteousness instead,” Upton says.

“Today we have the opposite of that. We have a lot of geniuses in Hollywood doing the opposite—trying to get viewers pulling for the success of evil.”

Upton cites as an example of this latter approach a made-for-television film, *Roe v. Wade*, portraying the events leading to the famous 1973 Supreme Court case which legalized abortion. Upton says actress Holly Hunter, in a piece of “brilliant propaganda,” skillfully recreated the character of “Jane Roe” as a “very likable ‘every woman’ on a quest to kill her child. The film had viewers pulling for her to kill her child. That the power of film—in the wrong hands,” Upton says.

He says he has come to the conclusion that “everything is propaganda,” and he says the theological writings of Christian apologetics Professor Cornelius Van Til, a key influence on Quade and Rushdoony, reinforced that view.

Translating Van Til’s scholarly language on the power of presuppositions into his own Southern California vernacular, Upton relates. “What I got out of Van Til is that everybody is trying to sell his own worldview. Everything we do is a religious act. A film-maker has to promote his worldview in the essence of the [film’s] character,” he says.

Upton says that in selecting subject matter for films, “my yardstick is. Do I have an answer for the problem?

“Usually the answer is: somebody has to roll his sleeves up and

get involved in the lives of other people and make a difference, by teaching and applying the whole counsel of God.” {226}

Shortly after making that statement in an interview for this report, Upton found himself reluctantly cast the role of just such a “somebody.” The result was that his career took an unexpected twist into a world of harsh social need that he admits has changed his life.

During this writer’s visit with him, there was occasion to review some videotape which taken in Romania, including heart-wrenching scenes at an orphanage. Upton expressed interest in doing a film on the plight of Romanian orphans, but was hesitant about making the arduous trip to that troubled country to obtain necessary additional material. The following evening, ABC Television’s *20/20* magazine program aired a report on the barbarous conditions in Romanian institutions for handicapped or other cast-off orphans—those who are called the “unsalvageables.”

The program cut into the heart of Upton’s deeply held convictions that Christians must be doers of the Word of God, not hearers only; and his initial reluctance to go to Romania evaporated. Within weeks, he left for the troubled Eastern European nation and found himself in an adventure filled with both intrigue and compassion. What had been planned as a short filming and fact-finding project turned into five weeks of direct intervention on behalf of scores of helpless and hopeless children. The film project was all but abandoned as Upton poured his time and energies into improving the situation of as many children as he could.

After frantic calls back to California to raise emergency funds and support and after difficult days of untangling red tape and resistance in Romania, Upton finally left the country with a blind teen-age girl and preliminary arrangements made for a new medical aid and adoption program.

Upton’s experiences were chronicled in January 1991 on a follow-up program on *20/20* and San Diego area newspapers widely featured his efforts and those of others whom he enlisted into his new Orphan Aid program. Orphan Aid has since blossomed into full-fledged adoption consulting service with staff both in the United States and Romania. Thousands of would-be adoptive parents continue to seek Orphan Aid’s assistance and numerous medical experts and other professionals have entered

their support. Upton found himself working long hours, full-time on the program, which he calls “Christian Reconstruction in action.”

But he confesses that his first love and still-perceived calling is the cinema, a medium which, he remains convinced, is a vital link in the movement to restore biblical norms to American society.

“My hope for the future of [Christian involvement in] this medium is {227} that our children will begin to understand theology enough to know what God requires of them,” he says.

“If some of them pick film and other media as a career, then their lives will have to reflect their worldview. If we have enough of that, we will, begin to see real changes in TV and movies and books and magazines. But with faulty theology...you’re not going to get anywhere.”

For Upton personally, film resolves his early discomfort with not being able to directly “witness” or orally share the Gospel with the lost.

“Millions have seen my films but they don’t know me—unlike TV preachers or people engaged in public debate about the faith,” he says.

“My job is not to ensure who or how many see my films, but to let the Holy Spirit work through the films with those whom He has prepared. I’ve had critical praise, and that shows that I’m doing things technically right. But what’s more important for me is to hear how my films have affected lives—a girl doesn’t abort her baby, a husband stops abusing his wife, etc. I don’t know them when the film is made, but I know I’ve been faithful when I see the results.”

Upton has indeed won critical acclaim. His pioneer work with hi-tech filming inside the womb produced astonishing footage of fetal resistance to abortion. The footage was used in widely acclaimed anti-abortion films, although others took credit for the depictions. A film he did under contract with Bethany Christian Services, entitled *Second Thoughts* won two major awards—the “Angel” award for excellence in religious films and a Southern California regional “Emmy,” the coveted top award of America’s television industry. *Second Thoughts* deals with the troublesome issues of teen-age sexuality and abortion and is being marketed with study helps.

Not every effort, as might be expected for a new film-maker, has been successful. One troublesome project was a film which was to be called *Breach of Contract*, a drama about a well-off wife with marital problems who gets mixed up with a gangster and nearly loses all in the process before she realizes that her life of disobedience has destroyed her. The film was panned by colleagues of Upton who previewed it—some of whom found its treatment of violence gratuitous, its plot overly sensational and lacking in rational foundations, and its cinematic devices trite. Numerous remakes and re-edits could not seem to overcome the problems.

“I thought I was being obedient to God by showing the dynamics of sin, but no one seemed to understand what I was trying to do, “ {228} Upton says, adding that after hours of agonizing reflection about what went wrong he concluded that the problem was with himself.

“I tried to use the tricks of the trade...instead of letting the body of the work stand on its own merit,” he said.

The latter approach proved highly successful in a delightful little film called *Go Get Your Stuff*. The film may have created a new genre. It is essentially a sermon delivered from the pulpit of a black church in San Diego’s inner city. The words of the sermon by St. Stephen’s Church of God in Christ Bishop George McKinney are a stirring call to Christian reconstruction of the city according to the demands of the Word of God. Interspersed with the sermon are scenes depicting the church’s hard-hitting street evangelism, Christian education and social ministries. The result is a film which comes from the very heart of Upton’s passion—transforming the Christian faith into real-life action, implementing the Gospel, rather than merely preaching it.

Upton says the film began with an observation that this church was doing just that. He said he simply asked McKinney to prepare a sermon on the general subject. The sermon itself suggested the format for the film and the powerful, even entertaining, message of the film just seemed to emerge.

The satisfying results of that film demonstrated something to Upton. “I now let the Holy Spirit reveal to me what he wants to do,” he says.

That works in different ways for dramas and documentaries, he says. In a drama, it is necessary to let the Holy Spirit “work

with you in creating drama in the script.” In a documentary, the inspiration must come in the execution, he says.

“In drama, if the actor is a heathen and puts his worldview into my character, I am not being faithful anymore. But a good actor, even if he is a heathen, can be faithful to my character if he believes in my character. He grants to the character the right to be faithful to the truth,” whether the portrayal be that of good or evil, he says.

If you get a powerful actor, he or she creates the character and the writer and director just sort of stand on the sidelines,” Upton continues, again citing actress Geraldine Page’s Oscar-winning portrayal of the Carrie Watts character in *The Trip to Bountiful*.

We don’t know if Geraldine Page is a Christian, but she did what was logical for that character to do and that was magic.”

Being obedient to the Word of God poses some unique dilemmas in film-making, Upton confesses. He admits to having been unable to resolve some of those dilemmas as yet.

For example, how do you portray evil?” he asks. “At what point {229} does it become gratuitous? How would you portray the Tamar story in the Bible, for instance? [2 Samuel 3:1–33]. On the opposite side of the spectrum, how do you portray a normal, even godly, husband and wife relationship which would include physical contact when the actor and actress are not married to each other? In a documentary, would it be sin for me to show a man’s stupidity so that God’s grace could be presented?”

Those are not just theoretical questions, as Upton’s struggle with *Breach of Contract* proved and as another incident over his filming of an actual abortion highlighted. In the latter case, one Christian critic expressed outrage that Upton could stand idly by while witnessing a doctor commit murder. Others defended Upton’s action as vital journalism, namely that capturing and disseminating images of the commission of a great evil are significant tools in bringing about a comprehensive end to such evils in society.

John Upton says he has been unable to answer such questions to his full satisfaction, but he remains determined to surrender both his art and life, his film-making and social action, to the ultimate and sovereign Director of the human scene, the God of the Bible.

Margaret Jenkins

“Grandma” *Margaret Jenkins* is 65 years old, but retirement is the last thing on her mind. Instead, she’s trying to raise \$3 million to expand the facilities and ministry of one of America’s most successful and exemplary Christian schools—an inner-city oasis of learning known as the Celeste Scott Elementary and Junior High School of Inglewood, Calif.

Inside a security fence rimming the bustling school compound, some 336 children, almost all black, are benefiting from Mrs. Jenkins’ commitment to “teach God’s precepts” in an environment of discipline and unmistakably genuine love.

The school is the realization of a vision which has driven more than half of the service-packed life of this untiring community leader who has been recognized widely by celebrities and civic officials.

It began in 1957 in Chicago, where Mrs. Jenkins was a song writer, music publisher and member of a popular Gospel music trio known as the Ladies of Song. It was that year, she says, when she received a vision from God of a burning building from which she alone was permitted to rescue imperiled children. She also saw a building which was inscribed “Spiritual Institute of Learning,” and she puzzled for years about what she had seen with her spiritual eyes. {230}

In 1964, one of the members of her trio, her beloved sister Mary Celeste Scott, found it necessary to move to Southern California. Not wanting to break up the Ladies of Song trio, Celeste begged Margaret and the third member, Hazel Stringer, to come along. After some resistance, they agreed. Tragically, Hazel died within a short time; the tragedy was compounded when Celeste also passed away in 1972. Margaret re-formed the trio (which continues with other members even today) and pressed on with her music interests and her career in a corporation under federal government contract.

“For a year I was disobedient to the voice of the Lord. I knew He had a greater work for me to do,” she relates.

She assuaged her disquiet somewhat by plunging into fund-raising activities to provide scholarships for needy young people. But throughout 1973 she continued to be nagged by a perception

that God had an even greater work for her to do, she says.

On one particular morning that year, she relates, she was leaving her home intending to go to her job at TRW Corporation. As she passed through the back door of her home, however, “all the strength went out of my body and I heard the voice of the Lord speak to me.”

She says she went back into the house and sat down at her piano. “Show me plainly what you want,” she says she told the Lord. “Show me plainly what you want.”

After sitting for a time, she concluded she should call her boss and tell him she could not come to work. Because she was well respected and a valued employee, her notice was readily accepted, she says.

About a half-hour later, a cheerful friend called to say he sensed something was troubling her. He went on to say that she might be encouraged to know that he had arranged for her to coordinate a religious scene for a Paramount Motion Pictures production to be called *The Day of the Locust*.

Thinking this opportunity may have been the focus of her early morning stirrings, she readily accepted. She responded the next day at the filming site, the Hollywood Palladium, where she formed a 40-voice choir and otherwise directed the activities for a church scene in the movie.

Paramount got more than it bargained for. Filming the scene took three days, but in the process, Mrs. Jenkins led a revival on the set.

“God moved in a mighty way,” she says, explaining how many on the production staff and a number of actors were deeply moved and convicted by her witness and work. The film’s director finally asked {231} her to address the company, and she offered what she calls a “sermonette,” which ended with conversions and a time of worship and praise.

She discovered later, however, that some changes were proposed for the film which she says violated her spiritual standards. She refused to sign certain releases concerning her part in the production and held up the film for three days, demanding further revisions to meet her standards. She says she eventually relented in her demands after her pastor advised her that she had done all she could and had every reason to be satisfied with her

own faithfulness.

Following that experience, she attempted to return to her job, but again, she recounts, her strength left her and she was again troubled in her spirit. Still puzzled about the Lord's intentions, she told her employer she would have to resign. Her request was reluctantly accepted and, she says, she was overcome by a sense of urgency to go on to whatever the Lord was calling her. Normally, she says, debriefing associated with leaving a federal-contract position would have taken at least two weeks. In her case, it took a single day, and as she left the company that afternoon "the Lord lifted all the weight off of me."

She says she heard God's voice, saying, "You're free."

"I said, 'What do you want?'" she relates. "He again showed me this school."

She shared her vision with some friends, who agreed to join her in establishing a scholastic foundation. Some time later, one of the young men who had been a member of her movie choir on the set of *The Day of the Locust* told her about a Seventh-day Adventist school building which was for sale in Inglewood, a close-in suburb of Los Angeles. Since she had wanted to pursue her vision in L.A. proper, she said she was not interested in the Inglewood property.

Nevertheless, she reluctantly drove to Inglewood to look at it, she says, adding that she could not immediately locate the property and left the area. When she got home, she says, the Lord instructed her to go back and try harder to find it. She did and was startled when she drove up to the school building. "That's the school I saw in the vision" in 1957 back in Chicago, she says she gasped. "I stepped onto the property and was anointed by the Spirit," she says.

Drawing on her corporate retirement benefits and what other funds she could muster, including some loans which were offered to her, she signed a purchase agreement. During the next three and one-half years, the sellers granted seven extensions for her payment into an escrow account, but a day of reckoning eventually came, with {232} a shortfall of \$50,000 remaining. Mrs. Jenkins and her associates worked intensely to find the needed funds and learned, at the last moment, of a well-endowed charitable foundation operated by a Christian Reconstructionist in Southern California. Contact was made and the Jenkins proposal was

favorably reviewed. Mrs. Jenkins and her colleagues spent many hours on the eve of the deadline in intensive prayer, and a check for the necessary funds was feverishly processed and delivered to the escrow account only moments before a courier from the sellers, a certain deacon who tearfully reported that no further extensions could be given, arrived before Mrs. Jenkins.

"I was calm. I said, 'Have you checked the escrow account?'" she relates, adding that there was great rejoicing and praising when the "miraculous" provision of the needed funds became known. Mrs. Jenkins still gushes with appreciation over the young president of the charity which made her school possible. His photograph hangs on her office wall.

Her first classes were held in 1976 and included only her own three pre-school grandchildren. But the Lord rapidly blessed the fledgling school and it soon grew to 100 students as grades were added. Enrollment has gone as high as 400 at times. The school offers a well-rounded program of academics, vocational training (including a computer program), a broad library, numerous extra curricular activities in sports and scholarly endeavors, drama, home economics, music (including a choir which has recorded an album), and organized group activities.

Mrs. Jenkins personally knows each of the 300+ students, whom she calls her "babies." Walk through the schoolyard with her and you will observe her greeting each by name. She will stop here and there to talk with individual students, and it is clear she knows the details of each one's daily progress ("He got an 'A' on his history test this morning," etc., etc.) The students all warmly greet her as "Grandma," and their love and respect for her is obvious.

She takes great pride in explaining her methods of discipline and the key role that discipline plays in her "babies" education and upbringing. The cornerstones of her disciplinary method are "tough love and forgiveness," she says. When there is misbehavior, stern but loving admonition includes an insistence upon genuine repentance, prayer for God's restoration, and reproof from God's Word. If there has been conflict between students, both are guided into reconciliation, including apologies, restitution when necessary, and physical embraces. Offenders are required to confess and to "pass {233} judgment on themselves." When corporal punishment is indicated, it is gently but firmly administered. Mrs.

Jenkins refers to it as “three swats for Jesus” and “applying the board of education to the seat of knowledge.” When its done, “I make ‘em hug me and I tell them, ‘Go and sin no more.’”

Her plans for campus expansion include a “prayer tower,” a turret on one of the proposed new buildings where she says she would like to be able to take troubled students for divine help.

Her discipline, intensive work on loving relationships, and uncompromising insistence on academic achievement, and strong emphasis on community participation and service have given Celeste Scott students the clear respect of the community. Mrs. Jenkins says her students are consistently compared most favorably with their counterparts in the public school, and the Christian school enjoys strong support in its neighborhood and wider Inglewood community. Her students themselves express their gratitude for the growth they achieve under her direction. Mrs. Jenkins says graduates, many of whom have gone on to substantial achievements, frequently return to her campus to offer their thanks and support.

“I’ve served them and now they’re serving me,” she says. “I want to raise stalwarts. If they’re tempted to do wrong, I want them to remember my face. I want to inspire them to go into the ‘vineyard.’”

The following words from a 1987 Celeste Scott School newsletter perhaps best summarize Margaret Aiken Jenkins’ approach to education.

Time swiftly brings about change and with the change we are made to realize that God’s unique creation, “Man,” has a continual, progressive, advance toward becoming what God created us to be. How does this come about? Through the Educational System designed by the Almighty God. The first words of the Bible say, “In the Beginning God Created” and it didn’t stop there; for He is still creating through us. “Why?” you might ask. The answer is, because He wants to get the glory out of our lives. This, we will share with each student in our school; that as they accept Christ into their lives, the Word will become life within them and we shall behold the Glory of Christ Jesus shining through them. With this knowledge and trust in God, each student will be able to face each challenge with confidence and develop into a spiritual, moral character and academic achiever. {234}

Dennis Peacocke

“The world has always been changed by true radicals,” says Dennis Peacocke.

Dennis ought to know.

In the turbulent 1960s, he did his share to revolutionize the world through his radical student activities at the University of California at Berkeley, where he majored in political theory. Converted in 1968, Dennis Peacocke has channeled his world-changing visions into radical strategies for extending the Kingdom of God. The archetype of a new breed of hard-hitting, charismatic, Reformation-based Christian “rebuilders” (his version of “reconstructionist”), Peacocke is an author and speaker whose compelling, sometimes withering, style—as the saying goes—“takes no prisoners.”

“You are involved in a battle to the death between two competing world systems over the control of this planet,” Peacocke begins his book, *Winning the Battle for the Minds of Men*. “At birth you were dropped in the midst of the battle zone. Although most Christians are unaware of the immediacy of this battle, every single one of us is involved because neither one of the two warring ‘superpowers’ [God and Satan] will allow any of us to remain neutral. This is a war being fought both with ideas and raw power. In our lifetime (or perhaps, by stretching it, in our children’s lifetimes), it will erupt into ultimate confrontation.

This is the ultimate battle between God and Satan, between the kingdom of God and the world system, between Jesus Christ and the devil. The battle lines have been drawn, the challenge has been raised and there is no backing out.”

From his home and headquarters in Santa Rosa, Calif., where one can rarely find him, Rev. Peacocke has launched a behind-the-scenes but powerful international ministry aimed at transforming Christian leadership, motivating youth, rebuilding cities, and capturing nations for the Kingdom. The ministry is known as “Strategic Christian Services,” the umbrella for a wide variety of instruments to effect change from the bottom up in America and other key points on the globe.

A sound is being made and thousands of Christians are responding,” says a brochure introducing SCS’s “Rebuilder

Institute,” which conducts resident seminars designed to give would-be world-changers necessary planning, organizing and administrative skills. “It is a sound for change, for a vibrant, organized spiritual army that reaches across denominational distinctives to move out and {235} disciple the nations. It is based on the truth of servant leadership. It calls Christians to begin to recapture society’s agenda based on the full assurance of what Christ secured for them at the cross. His conferred authority and commission to press the claims of His Word on a failing world order is striking new zeal in a generation of believers who don’t want to run from their problems, but apply God’s solutions to them instead!”

The Rebuilders Institute seminars are no Sunday school, as a listing of subjects covered makes clear: “strategic planning skills, resource management, networking and grassroots mobilization, geo-politics and megatrends, developing multiple ministries to change cities, dynamics of covenant leadership, understanding historical moments, preparation for public service, sustaining a quality family life in active ministry,” to name a few.

For Dennis Peacocke, no subject is without a biblical perspective, be it electoral issues, foreign policy, welfare, political theories and systems, media, agriculture, economics, education, history, law and justice, or family life.

“I’m concerned that the church is being pushed into a ghetto; that the secular, worldly forces are attempting to drive Christianity out of the fabric of this culture,” Peacocke said in an interview with David Hazard of *BridgeBuilder* magazine. “The secular media, in particular, pressure Christians with the idea that morality has no place in the marketplace of ideas.

“If we let the pressure work on us, we’ll be pushed into a ghetto. We must respond, not by being *defensive*, but by becoming *offensive*.

“Secondarily, as the world economy is shaken, the social services of the government will recede. This is a golden opportunity for the church to move in and become the governing force in the affairs of men and bless the world—to bring the kingdom of God into reality in men’s lives.”

According to Peacocke’s analysis, the present decaying situation can be described in the words of Nehemiah 1: “The walls are

broken down and the gates are burned with fire.” He outlines five key characteristics of the present crisis:

1. An increasingly hostile attitude by society toward Christian ethics and standards.
2. The rapid deterioration of family life in our culture.
3. The loss of private rights and freedoms as power is increasingly centralized in civil government. {236}
4. The threat of massive economic upheaval due to public debt and related errant economic policy.
5. Large numbers of ineffective and uninvolved Christians who are failing their duty to be “salt and light” in their communities.

Peacocke says these factors undermining society’s underpinnings require a fourfold response by Christians:

1. Repent for sins of apathy, ignorance and accommodation.
2. Survey the foundational needs of our surrounding communities.
3. Equip and organize Christians to meet these needs.
4. Creatively challenge our nation to debate and deal with the **real issues** that are destroying us morally, economically, and educationally.

One of the key tools or “working structures” proposed by SCS for such Christian action is the *City Action Council*, an organization for Christian community leaders. These councils of pastors, business leaders, activists and others function as problem-solvers and representatives of the private sector interacting with cooperative civil leaders. As such, these leaders are intended to function as “Elders in the Gates,” a reference to the Old Testament Hebrews’ community leadership structure.

Tom Jackson

“Christian leaders today find themselves in a very interesting dilemma,” says Tom Jackson, vice president of SCS. “At a time when the communities which make up our nation desperately need qualified leaders who embody and communicate biblical truth to free people from the oppression of sin and ignorance, a

considerable segment of our population continues to question the relevance of Christianity and the ability of its leaders to help set society's agenda. Unfortunately, this negative view of Christian involvement in shaping our culture is shared by many believers."

Citing Psalm 24:1, "*The earth is the Lord's and all those who dwell therein*," Jackson adds: "Christian leaders ought to represent the Owner's rights and perspectives in the government of His cities!"

The Rebuilders program is calling Christian leaders to return to the "gates" of their cities and develop themselves into servant-leaders to their communities, says Jackson.

According to SCS literature, a City Action Council is "a voluntary association of local community leaders who meet regularly to pray, strategize and take action; representing and applying biblical answers to community needs. It is locally controlled, yet loosely tied {237} into the network of spiritual leaders throughout the nation who are similarly concerned with serving their communities."

A City Action Council consists of three basic leadership groups: (1) local church leaders, (2) Christian business and organizational leaders and (3) elected officials who share with the council the community needs upon which the council may choose to focus its resources.

SCS lists the objectives of such councils as:

1. To form and maintain a prayer base under the community and all its major elected officials.
2. To focus public attention upon role models and community services that will inspire and equip the people in the community to embrace and exemplify sacrificial service, self-government, and the strength of healthy family units.
3. To promote unity among the Christian leaders of the community, and cooperation with elected officials as Christian leaders become problem-solvers and servants to the citizens of the community.
4. To help coordinate and focus the resources and values of the Christian private sector, meeting the broader needs of the community as a witness to Christ.

SCS says these objectives are consistent with five biblical principles of community problem-solving.

1. Freedom begins with self-government under God.
2. The family unit is the basic building block of a healthy society.
3. The local church is the primary equipping center for effective Christian service.
4. The stewardship of private property is essential to personal and societal maturity.
5. Rebuilding a nation begins with rebuilding local communities.

SCS's headquarters city, Santa Rosa, California, has served as an incubator and model for the "Elders in the Gate" approach. Although it lacks many of what Jackson calls "metro-plex inner city problems," it is a typical middle-range American city, making a transition from an agriculture-based economy to a rapidly growing commercial center. Located just north of San Francisco, one of the West Coast's major financial centers, it is experiencing many typically suburban social and economic problems. {238}

Into this situation, SCS introduced its City Action Council program, headed by SCS staff member Dick Williams. The following report, written by Jackson, describes the effort to establish a significant Christian influence on the city of Santa Rosa:

Our burden has been to make the purpose of a City Action Council work at "home." Through years of ministry we have seen the importance of bringing the elders to a place of unity and cooperation in the city. In this local situation the City Action Council has been God's way to begin to draw the church community together. Dick started with the specific issue of pornography. An obvious area where the community's "walls are broken down," this issue had the potential for a winnable battle through a wide variety of avenues at the local level to re-establish standards of decency. The local activists were in a period of transition, needing leadership and direction. Dick participated not by taking over the group but by supporting the emerging leaders and serving them. He has consistently taken the position of a learner. Eventually, he earned their trust and was able to help them to strategize. He offered mature male leadership in areas where, as you can imagine, there is a desperate need in dealing with the unique brand of spiritual warfare surrounding perversion. As a former pastor, he helped with the churches to establish rapport and build a network of volunteers. By working behind the scenes for the most part,

Dick was able to sidestep the negative image of being “anti-” and when necessary, others took that profile. *We must likewise learn to sacrifice personal recognition in order to win battles from a position of strategic wisdom.*

Ultimately, an ordinance was drafted to deal more effectively with a growing prostitution problem in the community. Doors began to open with city and county officials. Dick began to serve them in garnering much-needed support for the ordinance. He researched the issue and quickly became an “expert” on the specific ordinance that was in question. *Once a relationship of trust is established with officials, there are many practical ways to serve them which are often welcomed.* We may not realize the pressures that our public officials are under, because of financial cut-backs, lack of staff, and other priorities. Law enforcement is an obvious example of the {239} quandary of the “budgetary pinch” with the increasing problems of crime coinciding with diminishing finances. There is a growing need for community involvement and volunteers.

The open communication and familiarity with civic leaders led our City Action Council to investigate another serious social problem: the needs of the homeless. At first, many of the leaders, especially pastors, were not convinced that there was a problem. How many of the homeless had “chosen” their lifestyle? Various approaches were being offered in the community with little accountability and murky results. Now that the decency group was well-established, Dick again began doing research into this new realm of needs. Not taking the rhetoric of the social services and various agencies too literally, *Dick found himself continually asking the questions. “What are you really producing? What is your success rate? What are your long-term goals?”* Not intending to ask these questions from criticism, we discovered the actual results of many of these efforts were appalling. To be fair, sincere folks, many of whom are not Christians, were working very hard to alleviate these social problems out of deep convictions for people.

Nevertheless, the programs were often not Christ-centered, nor were they effective even from the world’s standards of measurement. There was a County Task Force which served as a clearing house but with little effective coordination. At one point a number of the leaders from the City Action Council took a well-prepared tour of facilities and locations related to the homeless problem. After weeks of research and meeting the individual players, Dick began to see

the continuum of events and issues involved in ministering to the homeless. Many of the organizations which are tied to government bureaucracy are vying for the same limited budget dollars and credibility. Additionally, the leadership of these groups can be very sincere but very carnal and selfish. *It is becoming evident that these difficult relational problems are perfect opportunities for "priestly mediation" which can only come from the church, perhaps not overtly, but quietly from the motivation and wisdom of service.* The Church is called to be a peacemaker as well as an instructor, if we will take the time to earn that privilege. Of course there will be areas of {240} resistance, but our good works should overcome much community fear, suspicion, or accusation.

Dick's work with the City Action council had brought him together with another church which had been supporting a fledgling ministry to the poor. These folks were dedicated Christians wanting to address the same concerns which the Council was facing. Why reinvent the wheel? Again Dick got involved with this ministry from a position of service to them in order to establish the organization with credibility in the community. The group already had a proven track record by hosting an annual "Love Feast" for the poor at Christmas, culminating in their last year with 6,000 free meals. Wanting to restore the needy to their full potential rather than just give handouts, they incorporated their efforts organizationally and made a step of faith more in the direction of permanent restoration.

An important opportunity immediately arose with a food program called SHARE. Not just a give-away, the SHARE program is a buying and distribution plan where low-income families can purchase groceries at one-third the normal retail price. Great for the elderly and those who are "down on their luck," it proved to be a wonderful open door to the churches. Though not strictly a Christian program, it became clear that churches could be a prime distribution point locally with only a minimum of volunteers. Thirteen churches have now come on line with eight waiting to be approved. By serving, we had an entry into various local churches never available previously. New relationships were cultivated. Through the food program a survey is being done on the various ministries already established in each church, many of which were virtually unknown to the rest of the city. The makings of a much-needed community resource handbook are now in the works. It will be written to include all the various Christian services as well

as very practical ways to identify the need and the initial steps toward solving the problem.

Amazingly, the door into the community continues to open. While investigating the distribution of goods and services to the poor, it was discovered that in the event of a natural disaster or emergency, the County's Disaster Relief Program was in great disarray. The 1989 earthquake had sensitized the [San Francisco] Bay Area to the crisis and our own area, though spared in [the 1989] quake, was quite unprepared for {241} such an eventuality. The city, the county and the Red Cross all assumed responsibility, but had worked out no coordinated plan. What was sadly lacking was an effective distribution network for food, clothing and medical supplies. Where would volunteers be trained and directed? The opportunity for the churches immediately became apparent. Utilizing the research from the food programs, it became clear that the churches with their distribution sites could adequately serve both purposes, if pastors and community leaders could be encouraged to do their part. Under pressure for answers, the response to such an idea has been overwhelmingly positive. Though much more planning is necessary to establish such a program, the necessary joint-approval has already been given. *Interestingly, such a plan will necessitate coordinated meeting with both church leaders and the designated authorities from most of the important spheres of government, including all the city mayors in the County.* What else could bring many of these leaders together in the same room to discuss their community? Theology, issues, politics? Hardly! *The key is service.*

Suddenly we are on the verge of so much opportunity that it is scary. Doors are opening faster than our ability to respond to the needs. We now realize that we will have to temper our excitement with wisdom. Some of these tasks require great resources. *We have formed a Business Council to work alongside of the City Action Council to begin to recruit and provide the expertise and resources of both the Christian as well as the broader community.* Again, by connecting Dick and his counterparts with other strategically important professionals in the city, the pipeline of resources can begin to flow from a private sector response. For instance, we discovered that several business leaders were already working on a proposal for low-income housing, a joint effort between developers and the planners, which is almost unheard of in this part of the country. Business leaders will have new confidence to become more involved because of Dick's commitment and research in the

community. *Many Christian professionals are just waiting for the right opportunity to sow time and resources once they trust that their sacrifices will go toward efforts that have a reasonable chance to succeed.* Much more could {242} be said, but hopefully we are describing the energy that is being unleashed through service, by using primarily one man's example of obedience to Christ. Obviously, many others have served alongside Dick and our purpose has not been to exalt him in an inappropriate way.

Jackson says the findings of Santa Rosa's City Action Council have led to the conclusion that "the Church has gained a reputation of being irrelevant to the real issues in our present society. Perhaps unfairly, and not entirely justified, such criticisms are not without some foundation."

He says the church has, in recent decades, looked to the state for aid rather than to establish an alternative example of service and cultural relevance.

"Though the Church is growing evangelistically in many parts of the world, somehow it has seemed to lose its bearings with regard to setting the standards of righteousness in law, economic justice, ministry to the poor, medical care, or technological advances," he says. "Even a cursory glance through history reveals that Christianity once had a major and vital influence on all these areas."

Jackson says the church's attitude concerning the nature of the Gospel is a primary key to reawakening culture through service.

"The Gospel must be embodied as well as preached to gain a credible hearing with the world," he says. "We must now take off our robes and follow Christ. Take off the robes of theological degrees, take off the robes of pastoral position, and take off the robes of pride and isolation" and demonstrate "Christ-like service ... setting new standards for the Gospel's effectiveness in our day."

Across the country, in Schenectady, New York, Christian leaders have adopted the City Action Council approach to begin solving problems in their community.

David Brown

David Brown, pastor of Community Fellowship in Schenectady, says it took two years to firmly establish the foundations for the

Council. “We’ve survived the rebuke and ridicule of critics and skeptics, and even our own lack of faith that something significant could happen among Christian leaders in our city.”

Brown says that original plans to tackle problems on the scale of a group of cities known as the “Capital District” were eventually scaled down to a more manageable effort involving only Schenectady. First a Pastors Council was formed consisting of seven pastors meeting monthly following a Peacocke Rebuilders seminar.

“Prior to that time, a couple of us had met with civic leaders (a city {243} councilman, county sheriff, city police chief) and began to dialogue. We listened to what they identified as their major ‘headaches,’ and they responded with interest to our offer of possible ways that we (as representatives of the church) might serve the city,” Rev. Brown says.

Later, the pastors hosted a Community Leaders Luncheon, to which selected civic leaders, clergy and businessmen were invited. From that base, a Business Council was formed and is growing. “The necessity of expanding our council of leaders beyond only pastors became evident in order to effectively serve our community,” says Pastor Brown.

One of the first expressions of cooperative effort was to sponsor a “Park Clean-Up Day,” which had been suggested by the mayor and city council.

“The city had become somewhat frustrated and embarrassed by the condition of a very lovely local park, Central Park, especially as targeted in a section known as the ParCours, a joggers’ trail that had become overgrown and seriously vandalized by gangs of kids,” Rev. Brown says.

Seventy-one volunteers were recruited from sponsoring churches to spend a Saturday picking up trash, trimming, weeding and raking, all at no expense to the city, which had run out of funds to do such jobs. A local food-store chain offered to supply free lunch to the volunteers.

“It was a pleasant surprise, perhaps a mystery, to the Mayoral Office and the local residents whose properties bordered the park, that ‘church people’ would do this kind of project—the Boy Scouts or the Jaycees, maybe, but ‘church people’—unheard of!” says Rev. Brown. The local media, all too typically, gave no recognition to

the Church's part in this effort. However, as publicity was not our motive, it was tremendously rewarding to take action to serve in the beautification of our city."

Following that project, Rev. Brown predicted that it would take 12–18 months to establish a fully functioning City Action Council, which he says could serve as a model for other Capital District cities. "The process seems slow at times, but experience and prior efforts tell us we have no other way to build, especially, if what we are attempting to do for the King and His Kingdom is to be effective," he says.

The City Action Council of Oklahoma City found that *building relationships*, though often a difficult task, was a key to its desires to apply Christian principles to public service. It found that honoring excellent performances by civic officials helped immensely in {244} cementing relationships with established city decision-makers. The Christian leadership group hosted an Honor Banquet, attended by 600 paying participants.

Pastor Herman Kanis

"We decided to target one area which, because of publicity, was fairly easy to identify," says *Pastor Herman Kanis* of Covenant Life Church of Oklahoma City. The area targeted was hard-core pornography and its distribution outlets, and the Honor Banquet was held to recognize the achievements of public officials and ministry leaders who had worked hard to rid the city of that blight. Not only were the honorees treated to the banquet, they were given a fully paid overnight stay in a quality hotel.

Many doors have been opened to public officials who heard about the event through favorable media coverage, Rev. Kanis reports.

As harmless as an honoring banquet may seem, Pastor Kanis says, it was difficult to rally the churches, who frequently resist ideas for cooperation. "We learned a valuable lesson in trying to get pastors involved in the project. For future projects, we are building relationships with people that God leads us to," he says.

Strategic Christian Services has recognized that its City Action Councils and related programs include a pitfall, falling into the "social gospel" mentality.

“Anyone even summarily aware of Western secular history, let alone the twentieth-century history of evangelical involvement in social issues, is painfully aware of the gravity-like pull of worldly thinking and practices on well-intentioned Christian people and projects,” SCS’s *Elders in the Gates* newsletter notes. “Many Christian social reformers started out with truly spiritual goals and motives and ended up looking like what they tried to change. Put another way, the world frequently has a better track record of changing Christians, than Christians have in changing the world. What starts out in the Spirit with Christian goals, dissolves into worldly approaches and carnal power plays.”

SCS says it must be remembered that City Action Councils are designed to be a source of spiritual leadership where common resources can be strategically applied to clearly defined problems. “Our actions or concerns must begin in strategic prayer and biblical analysis of the situation and stay free of single-issue mentalities or approaches. The council’s scope of concern must remain as broad as the scope of community life while carefully addressing the most important challenges that surround us. We must deal with many of the same issues that elected officials deal with, albeit from the orientation of a biblical solution.... {245}

“City Action Councils are not based on doctrinal uniformity in terms of church polity, eschatology, baptism, etc. What we do agree upon as Christians are the historic concepts of the church as embodied in the historic creeds. There are three particular theological assumptions that do significantly effect our work. First, the clear recognition that building in the present and the future is based on Christ’s victories already secured at His Cross and Resurrection in the past. Next, the clear understanding that society has no ‘neutral zones’ where rebellion is exempt from biblical principles and God’s Word. And third, the sobering reality that Godly leadership is called to deal with and help solve very taxing and complex problems. Many problems will humble us and take more time, energy and wisdom than we anticipate.”

SCS leaders emphasize that prayer and holiness within the councils is a “spiritual necessity rather than a religious, cosmetic exercise.”

“City Action Councils are coming. Yet many opposing forces will arise to test them. Only those built upon obedience, preparation,

perseverance and true spiritual authority will succeed,” they say.

Jay Parker

“They did it because we didn’t.”

That’s *Jay Parker’s* blunt explanation for why secular, humanistic civil governments and hypocritical liberal “humanitarians” are setting the agenda for social change and why Christians have become irrelevant and oblivious to social needs.

An unexpected perspective coming from a black leader. But J.A. “Jay” Parker, one of the nation’s most refreshingly candid and fiercely independent black leaders, is full of such unconventional insights. Parker is not only following a Christian Reconstruction approach to the issues of poverty and social empowerment, but he is *demonstrating* the practical viability of the biblical way in ways few other Christian leaders do.

Parker, a self-described “poor kid from South Philadelphia,” has become a unique kind of “Washington insider” with access to world leaders and a key role in what he calls “most of the bleeding heart causes” in the nation’s socially troubled Capital. His role in those causes ranges from volunteer to entrepreneur, from neighborhood charities to top-level policy-making. A caustic critic of liberal social engineering, Parker has earned his critic’s rights with hard work, self-determination and proven results for his alternative approaches. {246}

A conversation with Parker reveals a disarming blend of disdain for “bleeding heart” social rhetoric and genuine Christian concern for the real needs behind the rhetoric. “I want the real facts behind the surface before I sucker for the liberal line, says Parker, founder of the Lincoln Institute, an unusual Washington public policy “think tank” with a conservative perspective on race and poverty problems.

For Parker, the key to solving such problems is individual self-government, directed by the Word of God.

“I answer to one Person, and that’s God,” says Parker. “God is on the throne, and He made me a free individual. My freedom comes from God, not the Constitution or lawmakers. I serve Him. I’m occupying ‘til the Lord comes. My eye is constantly on God, not man—I’m not impressed by the achievements of man.”

He is even less impressed with the underachievements of man, and he argues that no American can rightly claim to be trapped long-term in social slavery or poverty. He offers his own life history as evidence.

Born in the ghetto of South Philadelphia in 1936, Parker admits to acquiring an early distaste for poverty and a curiosity about Philadelphia's old moneyed class.

"As a kid in South Philly, I knew about the old mainline wealthy. I looked around myself and at them and thought, 'This is me. I don't have what they have. I've got to get to know these people,'" he recounts.

He says he had just such an opportunity through his schooling at Chester Christian Academy, which was the beneficiary of support from a number of leading wealthy people. "I got to know them and their politics," he says. Among them was the millionaire philanthropist J. Howard Pew, the force behind the famous Pew Charitable Trusts. Pew was a conservative in a liberal mainline church, the United Presbyterian Church, and was at that time, according to Parker, "bankrolling" the evangelical publication, *Christianity Today*. Parker says he found it odd that Pew was "giving millions" to both the church and magazine in what seemed to a futile effort to "hold the line against liberalism." When he asked Pew why he stayed in a liberal church, Pew's answer, according to Parker, was that it was a matter of family and tradition.

"That was sad to me," Parker says. "He knew right but couldn't bring himself to do it."

Meanwhile, returning to an account of his childhood, Parker, who comes from a family of seven kids, says his own situation, contrasted to that of the wealthy, did not breed resentment in him so much as a {247} desire to improve his lot through his own effort.

"I was tired of being poor," says Parker, who gained further recognition of the contrast between rich and poor by reason of the fact that he wore hand-me-down clothes from a rich kid. In this case, the rich kid was a fellow black, the nephew of the famed Negro singer, Marian Anderson—James DePriest (now conductor of the Portland Symphony Orchestra).

"He had everything. I had nothing. We lived in the same neighborhood, were both black, but there was no equality," Parker says.

Seeing that there was “another side to life,” however, inspired the young Jay Parker, who has been a Christian since age 14, to work.

I always worked. I scrubbed floors. I worked in a drug store after school from 4 to 11 p.m. I developed a work ethic,” he says.

My father gambled and drank and was never home. He would work weekdays and was gone on the weekends. My mother was a Christian, but kind of a rebel. She was a descendent of a Baptist pastor, so, for spite, she went to a Pentecostal church,” he relates.

“My older brother was a hustler, and he worked hard at it,” he adds, noting that in the social setting in which he grew up, achievement of any kind meant power. “I had no choice. I had to beat him so he couldn’t tell me what to do. I didn’t want to ask him for anything, so I worked harder.”

Parker says he collected old newspapers on foot (it wasn’t until later that he acquired a little wagon to haul the papers in.) He discovered that if he *ran* on his collection rounds, he could “beat the old guys with push carts and trucks.” In addition to collecting papers, he worked in stores, cleaned ash bins, and ran errands, all of which helped him build a little nest egg which grew. After a time, he was able to go to movies, and buy his own clothes—no more hand-me-downs from richer kids.

“Other kids who didn’t hustle couldn’t even go to the movies,” he says. “I dressed very well. I bought from the best men’s store in Philadelphia. I even made recommendations to them on what to buy.” As he became older, he was able to buy a sports car—and he bought it from a very exclusive dealership, he recalls.

“I’m still convinced that I can outwork anybody in the world,” he chuckles. “I have no sympathy for kids who don’t want to work. When young kids complain to me about inequality and lack of access, I always tell them the story about me and James DePriest.”

Parker still has no time for people who “have no purpose in life,” including the “homeless” he frequently steps over as they lie on the {248} sidewalk outside the door of the offices of Jay Parker & Associates, his international affairs consulting firm in downtown Washington, D.C.

Before he offers any sympathy to such individuals, “I want to know the rascals and find out why they’re homeless,” he says. “When they were kids, were they in church? Where is their pastor? Their parents, their relatives—where are they? Were they failures?

If they (the homeless) are absolutely down and out, there's help available. There's no reason for them to be lying on the sidewalk," he says.

"I know my own relatives. They had the same opportunities I had. But they're hustlers, always trying to shake people down. I won't help those who could help themselves," he says candidly.

He contrasts his grandmothers—one of whom inspired him and helped him open his first bank account with \$12 and who now never asks for help—with a brother, who, he says, spends most of his time gambling in Atlantic City. Of his grandmothers, he says, "They always get what they need. We're devoted to them.

But we won't help relatives who lead immoral and irresponsible lives, because they must suffer the consequences of their own actions."

Such expressions might seem proud, harsh and insensitive were it not for the fact that Jay Parker, who now lives comfortably in a Virginia suburb of Washington and enjoys the company of some of the world's highest ranking "movers and shakers," is widely respected in the Washington area for his charity and his commitment to rehabilitation of the poor. His record of service is matched by few. A partial listing of his Washington community activities includes.

President of Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind, director of The Fund for American Studies, past advisory board chairman of the Salvation Army, member of the board of the Easter Seal Society, president of Kiwanis Club of Washington, co-chairman of American African Affairs Association, chairman of a management committee for the Anthony Bowen Branch of the YMCA, member of the Greater Washington Board of Trade, International Club of Washington, International Platform Association, University Club of Washington, chairman of the board of Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries, director of USO of Metropolitan Washington, member of the White House Regional Fellowships Selection Panel, director of President Reagan's Transition Team at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, member of the Secretary of the Army's Science Board, member of the White House Task Force on Drug Abuse, and member of the United States UNESCO Commission.

For Parker, volunteerism and service are the surest paths to {249} community leadership for those who are willing to fully commit

their lives to worthy causes. When others fade, the committed person emerges at the top by default, he argues.

“The key is to volunteer and to work and to stay at it until everybody else is gone. When everybody else has left, I’m still there. All you need is *staying power*. I go to all the meetings. I outlast everybody else. Burn-out is an excuse used by those for whom participation is a fad, not a commitment. Stress is an excuse people use. You have to know why you’re there, and then go in and do the job.

“I bring no special talent and no treasure, but whenever anyone turns around, I’m there,” he says, explaining why he has emerged as a leader of so many causes in Metropolitan Washington.

“It’s what Christians ought to be doing,” he says, explaining that “it,” in this case, is *servicing*, “not just trying to prove a point.” He says the motto of many churches working in areas of need used to be “soup, soap and salvation.”

“At one time, all charities were organized by the churches, but they were talked into staying in the pulpit and preaching only salvation. The public sector took over when the church walked away from it.”

Parker says that during the 1980s, however, there was the beginning of a small reawakening to the need for individual effort and service that is independent of government. He says that President Reagan was able “to set a new tone...and that’s all he did...that government doesn’t have to spend, spend, spend and take care of people from the cradle to the grave.”

The debate has been changed from “how much” can government do to “whether” government should do it. The debate has moved to a “public-private” partnership, and this is a major shift in focus. Now people don’t want to be taxed for something that doesn’t work.”

But for Parker, the best solutions to social problems are not found in either the public sector or the private economic sector. The best source of social reconstruction, he says, is in the “independent sector”—Parker’s term for non-profit organizations and volunteerism, including the work of churches and charities.

“I got involved in this stuff to improve the independent sector—to see if ‘reclaiming the American Dream’ was possible,” he says, describing his motivations. “I asked myself, ‘Can the independent

sector make a difference?’ It may take 50 years to find out. I’m just now proving that the independent sector works, but my efforts have been limited to local efforts.” {250}

He says he was also motivated by a desire to “get out of the defensive posture brought on by liberals who claim that conservatives are not compassionate. I wanted to show them I’m a bleeding heart, too, and that I can out ‘hand-wring’ the liberals,” he says. “My record is unsurpassed in this community. We’ve turned-around quite a few things.”

Among Parker’s most visible and significant “turn-arounds” was his successful takeover of Washington’s once-bankrupt Goodwill Industries, the local outlet of the well-known, nationwide, non-profit, assistance and rehabilitation program. Under Parker’s guidance some years ago, David Memorial Goodwill Industries emerged from the shambles of bankruptcy to a thriving enterprise with more than a \$1 million surplus, he says. The program now operates sheltered workshops for the handicapped, five retail stores, a fleet of trucks, and numerous drop centers for discarded items. In a recent year, more than 600 persons were served in nine separate programs operated by Goodwill’s Rehabilitation Services. In keeping with his spirit of independence and love of efficiency, he pulled Goodwill out of the United Way campaign because, he says, United Way was wasting resources, something which he says was incompatible with the role of fiduciary he had assumed as head of Goodwill.

Parker’s founding of the Lincoln Institute came out of what he says was a “sense of frustration” with such organizations as the NAACP, Southern Christian Leadership, National Urban League and other black-advocacy and activist groups.

“All were on the Left and all were advancing policies that I consider harmful to the interests of black Americans,” he said in a published interview some years ago.

“That is, they were representing themselves as acting on behalf of the black community yet tailoring their arguments so that they advanced the positions of the ‘Liberal’ wing of the Democratic Party on everything from domestic to foreign policy. And so questions as diverse as tuition tax credits, the Davis-Bacon Act, minimum wage, deregulation of oil and gas, and even peace through strength were presented as if the approach of the ‘Liberal’

Democrats was in the best interest of the black people.

“We try to point out that this is not the case and that there is a workable alternative. That alternative is to remove dependency on the overseers of the ‘new plantation’ by ending dependency upon the federal, state, and local governments and bringing us back to individual responsibility.

“We are trying to remind the black community of how our {251} forebears once endured the moral and legal wrong of slavery which violated our most basic personal property rights. We think this gives blacks a special understanding of why we must resist dependency for ourselves and for the generations that will follow.”

Kristin Blair

Kristin Blair went to Washington, D.C., to become a “political star.”

Instead, she has become part of a what sometimes seems like an underground—a growing but struggling network of Christians who believe God’s Word is the Capital’s only hope for deliverance from spiritual decay.

“This city is a place of spiritual darkness,” says the 29-year-old law student at George Mason University. “Capitol Hill, especially, has an aura all its own. Homosexuality, drug use, prostitution, wicked political deals, humanism, atheism, occultism...they all combine to create an unholy atmosphere. As believers, we are to dissemble, to defuse that atmosphere with God’s Word.”

Trained as a journalist, Ms. Blair came to Washington, like many youths enamored with public life, seeking fame and fortune in the seat of world power. She describes herself as typical of many young people who come to the capital at high school or college age, working, often long hours, as interns in Congressional offices, then moving up the ladder, perhaps to a think tank such as the Heritage Foundation or Brookings Institute. There they take low-level research positions, in hopes of getting a foothold into something bigger. Ms. Blair, who compares the process to that which hopeful starlets go through in Hollywood, says the competition for desired positions is fierce and results in “a lot of jealousy and backbiting.”

Ms. Blair found herself as a researcher for the conservative think tank, the Free Congress Association, and made many contacts on

Capitol Hill and elsewhere in important Washington locales. The deeper she got into the system, however, the more she began to feel the weight of spiritual oppression in that city, she says, noting that this was particularly noticeable in and around Congress.

She sensed that she had been brought to the Christian faith and to this place for the purpose of being a witness to the power of God to transform, she says, noting that she personally had earlier been delivered from interest in the occult, which has a strong influence on Capitol Hill. In the residential community around Capitol Hill, dubbed by some as the “Fruit Loop,” she says, “there is every kind of perversion. This whole city is teeming with homosexuals.” {252}

“God seems to use me in dark places, maybe because he’s made me understand spiritual warfare. To be effective here, you’ve got to understand spiritual warfare,” she says.

Even within the more “straight” conservative sector in Washington, there are few “true Christians,” despite first impressions. Rather there are “crisis conservatives,” who firmly believe in “political salvation,” she says.

During her career at or around Capitol Hill, the young Ms. Blair came to see her personal mission as a Christian to be a “witness.”

“To me, any subject of conversation could be made a point of reference to God,” she said. “I learned how to steer conversations to God. It was like being a missionary in a foreign country. You come to this strange country of Capitol Hill, and you have to learn the language, new customs. So that’s what I did. I immersed myself. I associated with these people and read the literature. If I could share the Gospel, I’d consider it a good day.”

While at Free Congress, she met many “scholars with tough questions,” she says, adding that her witness to these contacts resulted in at least one conversion, a “brilliant” individual who is now working with Accuracy in Academia.

God has taken me on a spiritual odyssey through all of this, eventually bringing me to Calvinism, which really helped me understand the nature of my witness,” she says.

Ms. Blair says that to minister effectively to Washington’s policy developers, a Christian must constantly be working at developing his or her own intellect. “They need intellectual companionship and stimulation. The level of education is very high among the intellectual elite in Washington. But religious ignorance is also

very high. There is a very low level of understanding.

“You have to learn how to *apply* your faith to work here. You have to be watchful for opportunities to influence the political sphere. Sometimes you have to *make* opportunities, design creative ways to apply the faith,” she says.

She says that in the face of all the phoniness in Washington an effective Christian witness requires intellectual honesty. “False faces don’t work here. People here are very vulnerable, very approachable. There is great isolation at the top, a longing for relationships,” she says.

People have a funny idea about Washington. There’s a certain Washington mystique, but this place is filled with people who are hurt and lonely and need to know the Lord.”

In the midst of this, there is a small and struggling network of {253} believers in Washington who try to maintain contact with each other and often converse about how they can bring the Kingdom of God to bear upon Washington’s unique situation, she says.

“The environment here is deteriorating,” she says. “But God is refining the believers. The Christian network is growing—but not fast enough, either in terms of its message or in being bold in the application of the Word. Too many believers are keeping to themselves.”

Christians of the “Moral Majority” type haven’t changed the foundations which liberalism has so firmly established in Washington by capturing the media, the arts, education, she says.

“To impact national leadership requires more than just politics,” she says. “To attack the Washington foundations, there must be grass roots change in the electorate. Then out of a changed electorate, there will emerge a new Washington. People ‘outside the Beltway’ [the Washington insider’s term for the rest of the country—Ed.] must start to care. There is a feeling that the outside world doesn’t care or know what goes on here.”

Tom Hannah

One Washington insider who *does* know and care about the outside world is *Tom Hannah*, chief administrative assistant to Rep. Ron Marlenee, R-Mont. Mr. Hannah, formerly a real estate

broker, came to Washington at the height of a political career of his own in the Big Sky Country, where he served in the state House of Representatives from a district in Billings.

Mr. Hannah first ran for the Montana House in 1978, challenging an incumbent, the wife of a liberal minister and one of the most outspoken social/peace/liberation activists in the state. He lost by 52 votes that time, but two years later, when the incumbent decided not to seek re-election, Mr. Hannah swept in with the Reagan landslide. He was easily re-elected in '82, '84, '86 and '88, running unopposed in his last bids. Hannah rose rapidly through the legislative ranks to key committee chairmanships and eventually, unopposed, to the position of majority (Republican) floor leader, where he was able to wield significant influence for Christian causes and interests—especially Christian and home-school education and pro-life issues. He also became one of the state's leading champions of private property rights and reduction of tax burdens, especially property tax burdens.

“Not only does government transfer wealth, but it transfers pain,” {254} says Hannah, describing what he says is the expansive reach of the distress which excessive taxation and government interference in private lives, estates and fortunes create.

“It's happening more and more” in the resource-rich Treasure State of Montana, where natural wealth is increasingly untouched due to utopian socialist influences which have tied up the state in environmental restrictions, colossal resource taxation and business regulation, Hannah says.

He relates a typical example: a former struggling small businessman he once met at an airport in Montana. The man was leaving his family behind to find work out of state and earn enough money to eventually bring his family with him. “People can't work here. They can't support their wives and kids. They are forced to leave. When the government so heavily burdens property with taxation, it takes our future (our children's inheritance) and finally it takes our soul,” he says.

Hannah says that modern government's concern over social problems which demand so much of the public treasury is largely the result of the state's own smothering of the idea of personal responsibility. Drunkenness is depicted as a disease and not a failure of moral controls; poverty is not seen as the inevitable fate

of the sluggard, for example, he says.

“When you take away personal responsibility and replace it with government benefits, you take away incentives to change,” he says. “You replace the God who is over the state and make the state your God.”

Hannah says this replacement can be seen in the contrast between the biblical view of the American Founding Fathers and the proponents of the modern view embodied in the 1973 Montana Constitution.

The Montana Constitution’s Declaration of Rights (Article II) is a ringing humanist/collectivist/revolutionary anthem, stating:

Section 1—Popular sovereignty. All political power is vested in and derived from the people. All government of right originates with the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole.

Section 2—Self-government. The people have the exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign and independent state. They may alter or abolish the constitution and form of government whenever they deem it necessary.

This is anything but a constitution; it is a manifesto for democratic revolutionism. Nothing is constituted; the only things institutionalized {255} are the winds of change, as defined by the ever-fluid popular will.

In contrast to this idea of popular sovereignty, the early American System was based on the knowledge that all power, authority and rights come from God, that government is ordained by God and is set up under His authority for the orderly disposition of the affairs of men, Hannah says.

“The biblical mandate for government is to punish evil and give free rein to good,” he says. “The Christian in government must understand and delineate the biblical definition of good and evil, and this will manifest itself in the government’s approach to abortion, homosexual rights, education, and more. It’s a matter of definition. The state has defined what education is, for example, and based on that definition it has demanded allegiances in the lives of our children.

“Christians say they believe the Bible, but a lot of Christians haven’t thought about how the Bible orders life.

“Government by its very nature establishes the sideboards of good and evil. The question is, whose sideboards—those who say man is the center of the universe and the supreme object of worship or those who say God is? How you answer that question determines the nature of government and the shape of legislation,” Hannah says.

“It will distinguish the Christian from the conservative,” he adds, describing an ideological odyssey which he himself had to make before understanding this.

“As a conservative, I used to vote for a very tight ship, as far as spending on social services goes. I was also very vocal on ‘pro-life’ issues. One day a social worker from (the Division of) Developmental Disabilities asked me how I could justify families keeping (unborn) deformed and mentally retarded children while at the same time I was not helping those people care for such children when they are born and as they go through life,” he says.

Hannah says that remark made him realize he needed to be more sympathetic to the plight of those who, through no fault of their own, cannot care for themselves or for their dependent relatives. He says he concluded that the answer to that particular problem could be group homes and educational programs for handicapped children, but he knew that such programs require large amounts of money.

Hannah says the church and Christian individuals have failed to see that they have the responsibility to meet such needs. Instead, they have allowed government to claim the financial resources of individuals and assume responsibility for social care.

“The blessing of helping one another within the church is lost,” he {256} says. “We must realize that (financial) resources are all God’s. He owns the cattle on a thousand hills. We think resources belong to men and we ask government to redistribute them on our behalf. It comes back to this, the sin of man from the beginning of time was to put his hand and his name on God’s resources.”

Hannah says Christians cannot argue that they simply don’t have enough resources to do the job.

“The money spent on entertainment about equals the amount spent on national defense. The money is there if we want to use it to meet our responsibilities. We wouldn’t need government social services if we met our responsibilities. The ingredient that

both government and the churches are lacking is discipline and personal responsibility," he says.

This failure is manifest throughout our social system, he says, reflecting the fact that "the sin of man is pervasive" and resulting in the fact that "the blessing of the Lord has been lost in our modern day."

Hannah says that insisting on the principle of personal responsibility in a fallen world can render some harsh results, but that is the way God "cast the die." He discusses, for example, a typical argument against giving parents exclusive responsibility for their children's education. That some parents would simply work their kids rather than educate them.

"We just have to say that there must be freedom to let such families fail," he says, "because if you say that society has the right to take a child from an irresponsible parent, then whatever society wants it can take. The sins of the fathers are visited upon the children. That's the way it is sometimes. On the other hand, we overlook the Booker T. Washingtons, who rise above their circumstances by realizing their personal responsibilities.

"The cost to our families, churches and nation of turning over our responsibilities to the state is so great that it will be our demise."

One of Hannah's strongest interests as a public official (and father of four) has been biblical educational alternatives to public schools.

"Education is a very interesting area because it has such strong sympathies. At the same time we're taking away family and personal responsibility, we're having a serious decline in this area. We have a disaster on our hands. The dollars being spent for schools to deal with major social problem areas is out of hand. We're spending so much on these things that we can't afford math and science. And yet kids are being shot, teachers are mugged, scores are declining, and ignorance is staggering, even among teachers," he says. {257}

(Citing an example of teacher ignorance, Hannah relates the remark of a public school teacher who once told him that "if Gorbachev doesn't pull this (glasnost and perestroika) off, he won't be re-elected.") He says much of the electorate are just as uninformed and naive about the fact that public education is dumbing-down the population while public educational officials

are doing their best to put obstacles in the way of Christians who seek a better way.

“Politically, those kind of people (the naive) are more dangerous than those with an agenda. If the intellectually honest man says schools should be the agent of social change, he’s dangerous—but at least you can argue with him.”

Another area which has concerned Hannah is the growing power and influence of environmentalism. Montana socialists succeeded in giving constitutional stature to environmental ideology in 1973, and the result, says Hannah, is the “choking off of any attempt to take dominion over God-given natural resources.” The subsequent loss of Montana’s mining, timber, agricultural, and hydropower industries—four of its primary economic backbones—has crippled the state’s economy and historic way of life.

“It all comes from an incorrect view of what resources have been given to man for,” Hannah says. “Of course, it was also in part a reaction to man’s wrong use of resources—exploitation, rather than stewardship. There was no balance.”

He says that when the utopians began to take over the state in subtle and then blatant ways during the 1960s and early ‘70s, Christians and others with historic Christian values were “asleep at the switch,” while the utopians moved with fervent commitment.

“We’re being out-resolved. The reason is that we have had a fuzzy-headed theology and there was a certain sense of being comfortable in our wealth and position in the Christian community,” he says, adding that, happily, there are signs of a change in thinking by some Christians.

“We’re seeing an increase in Kingdom activities. There’s a real thrust toward Christian training, upbringing and help for Christian businessmen. There’s one critical area left—politics—that needs an infusion from the remnant of God’s people. Not politics as salvation, but as salt in society.”

Hannah says the story of Gideon in the Bible “shows that it doesn’t have to be the biggest and best force, but it has to be a force that is willing to serve, to take the bushel off the lamp, the torch out of the jar. I see more and more people taking their torch out of the jar—in {258} families, businesses...but when you mention politics, people want to put the torch back in the jar.”

Howard Phillips

If there is anyone in Washington who could qualify as a Gideon in our time it is *Howard Phillips*, leader of The Conservative Caucus and guiding light behind a new biblically oriented political party, the U.S. Taxpayers Party.

For more than 30 years, Mr. Phillips, usually opposing the tide, has been working against what he calls “a corrupt cultural, financial, and political establishment which rejects the heritage of American liberty and has set our beloved country on a track to disaster.”

During a luncheon interview near his Vienna, Virginia, offices some time ago, Mr. Phillips said Christians and “all those who believe in the biblical premise for society” are in the best position to bring about positive change in the American system.

“Our job is to define how society is to be governed in terms of biblical law,” he said. “Once defined, there will be a constituency for implementing it. Within four or five decades, the crisis will be so enormous that people will be ready to accept fundamental changes, and it is not pre-ordained that they will choose an evil course for change.”

Phillips, a student of the writings of Chalcedon philosopher-theologian R.J. Rushdoony, says he has found in Rushdoony’s works the necessary principles for re-ordering society along biblical lines. “It only remains for us to pull together these principles and implement them. He’s rediscovered for all of us what we’ve forgotten.”

In the political realm, “citizenship” must be re-established as the only rightful basis for democratic participation, Phillips says.

Phillips, who has taken a keen interest in developments in Southern Africa, Eastern Europe and the Baltics, rejects the idea that participation in political decision-making must be on the basis of “one man, one vote.” He says the more proper phrase would be “one citizen, one vote.”

How does one qualify as a citizen? “By accepting the presuppositional basis of the society in which one wishes to become a citizen—including its productivity.”

Phillips argues that one must be productive to be considered for citizenship. Furthermore, since productivity is the basis for

taxation, one must be a contributing taxpayer in order to have a right to participate in political decision-making effecting the productivity of {259} the society. "If you don't pay taxes, you must be deprived of the opportunity to direct the affairs of society," he says, adding that this basis for democratic participation avoids the "trap" that qualifies a person for citizenship on the basis of birth or race. Natural status and racism thus are eliminated as factors in social self-determination, and individual worth and fulfillment of duty before God are the governing principles, including those which determine social provision.

According to Phillips, "the proper basis for participation in society is one's productive contribution to society. Economic self-sufficiency ought to be the criterion."

In the American system, he says, civil government was not seen to have been born out of some naturalistic social contract but in "constitution-making," which he defines as "covenanting" in the biblical sense. Any change which takes place in the basic covenant should come only after lengthy periodic reviews, national debate and reaffirmation of founding principles, not by "tinkering with the premises," as he says the courts have done in recent years.

Based in this idea, Phillips' U.S. Taxpayers Party believes it can make "a major contribution to reframing America's political debate" by campaigning for "policies which 'ought to be,' rather than those which merely seem 'pragmatic.'" Phillips calls this raising "the right standard."

"The U.S. Taxpayers Party will provide the means to express politically that which millions of Americans know to be true and necessary," he says. "Strong medicine is consumed only when circumstances seem to require it. But even the reluctant patient will take comfort knowing that the strong medicine is available. In God's providence, if we do our job well, our countrymen may, in time of extreme crisis, accept what we prescribe."

To this end, Phillips' goal is to launch, in time for the 1992 elections, a party which "advances principles and policy objectives consistent with the Bible and the Constitution of the United States, whose purpose, both by fielding its own candidates, and by co-endorsing, where appropriate, candidates for other parties, is to establish, in the context of the American political process, a right standard for civil government and an electoral rallying point for

those who, in agreement with our purposes, choose to join us.”

“Our goal is a depoliticized, degovernmentalized society with market accountability,” says a USTP brochure. “Government regulation and subsidy diminishes liberty. To the degree that government exercises legitimate authority, political accountability is essential. electoral, bureaucratic, and judicial.” {260}

As a student at Harvard in the early 1960s, Phillips overcame liberal opposition and faculty hostility to twice win election as president of the Student Council.

In 1964, he and some colleagues recruited and elected hundred of new members to win control of the Republican Party in Boston, which he chaired for two years in what he describes as “successful confrontation with a failed GOP establishment.”

From 1964 to 1968, he helped rebuild the national Republican Party, recruiting thousands of young people and minorities to civic activism and public service careers.

“During the Nixon Administration, as head of two U.S. government agencies, I got a solid four-year education in just how badly the Federal government is permeated with waste, corruption, moral cowardice, and destructive ideological activism,” he says.

One of those agencies was the Office of Economic Opportunity, which he says was being used for to make grants of “ideological patronage” for a network of neo-Marxist organizations. Phillips battled to terminate such grants and contracts, making enemies “of whom I remain proud.”

“The path of principle on which I embarked was followed to the verge of victory when, unfortunately, even as we were scoring decisive victories in key Congressional roll calls, a Watergate-weakened Richard Nixon broke his pledge to veto continued funding of “Great Society’ programs,” he says.

“Accordingly, the agency’s activities were preserved, much to the delight of Mr. Nixon’s enemies and the disappointment of those who had worked hard to eliminate the McGovernite programs against which Mr. Nixon had campaigned in 1972. I decided to resign from government to fight for what I knew to be right.”

Phillips spent the rest of the 1970s directing the non-profit Conservative Caucus to develop a nationwide grass-roots strategy “by which the unrepresented general interest might effectively challenge the D.C.-based power of federally funded special interest

groups.”

The Conservative Caucus clearly made its presence known in Washington, and although its record of goal accomplishment has been mixed, it has influenced several major policy moves—most notably, perhaps, prevention of ratification of the SALT II treaties.

“It’s virtually impossible to win political battles in D.C. when the leaders of both major parties are lined up against the policies you favor,” Phillips says. “Accordingly, with the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980, strategic requirements changed. It became necessary to {261} shift our focus from Congress and concentrate on influencing the direction of the Reagan Administration.”

Again the results were mixed, but Phillips and colleagues played important roles in nudging the administration toward important goals, such as the Strategic Defense Initiative, support for anti-Communist freedom fighters in various world locations, and cutbacks in federal subsidies for left-wing ideological advocacy.

“After a decade of Reagan and Bush, the Washington-based conservative movement is at a dead end,” Phillips says. “Grass roots supporters have grown weary of the battle, frustrated by political betrayal, and seemingly impotent to achieve significant victories on issues they care about.

“Those who control the government have been only marginally inconvenienced by anti-establishment protest—because, in the context of the present two-party system, ‘fed-up’ Americans have ‘no place else’ to go on election day.”

In Phillips’ assessment, America is in trouble and what he calls the politics of conventional ambition and political pragmatism are not working.

“We face crises which are, at once, economic, geostrategic, institutional, and, above all, moral,” he says. The dumbing-down of school textbooks, the insidious vulgarity conveyed on television, and the degrading humanist culture portrayed and purveyed on our movie screens has helped produce a nation of sheep, spectators who reject the very premises of our nation’s Godly heritage, and who too often lack the discernment, or knowledge of history, to reject the incremental, escalating, political confiscation of our individual liberties and national autonomy.”

Phillips says his new-party movement’s objective is “more profound” than victory or defeat in particular electoral contests.

“Our goal is to recast the entire dialectic of American politics away from humanistic, socialist materialism, and back in the direction of biblical, constitutional liberty.”

He finds guidance in the words of George Washington, who said at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, “If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God.”

Thomas Moore

“Unless there is a resurgence of biblical polity,” says {262} Thomas Moore, whose government service has taken him deep into the heart of the Pentagon, “there will be real trouble in this country.”

Moore came to Washington in 1983 as a Reagan appointee—deputy assistant secretary of education. Unhappy in that position, he resigned in 1985 and spent the next two years at a private defense foundation—High Frontier, the organization which has been the leading promoter of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

A graduate of The Citadel in South Carolina and holder of a master’s degree in national security studies from Georgetown University, Moore began working at the Defense Department in June 1987 and became the secretary of defense’s legislative liaison for SDI, where he was serving at the time he was interviewed for this report.

Moore says that during the Reagan Administration there were a number of key individuals working within the SDI program and elsewhere in the administration who held a Christian worldview. He credits President Reagan with opening the doors, at least initially, to that perspective within the national government, but he says things deteriorated near the end of the Reagan administration. That change included shifts in views on defense, a shift which he says he was unable to explain other than that it seemed to represent or at least follow a “collapse of the moral center of the administration.” He said Reagan’s shift toward disarmament and closeness to the Soviets suggested that Reagan himself had lost control and that the State Department and the arms control “establishment” had taken over policy.

Moore also blames the Christians who promoted Reagan and assisted in the early phases of his administration for much of the “collapse of the moral center.”

“When Ronald Reagan was elected, Christians went home and said ‘all’s well with the world,’” he says. Moore says that he was encouraged that Christians got “back into the field” when Pat Robertson ran for president, but he said that effort proved ineffective because Robertson’s “ineptitude was colossal.”

Moore says the Christian worldview has not yet prevailed in Washington because Christians who were vocal in national affairs in the past few years have “not succeeded in demolishing the false worldview” that has dominated Washington.

“Many Christians have not had the proper theology, but the Falwell types never were on the cutting edge here,” he says. “The antinomian position is not really on the ascendancy. The real horsepower has come from people who think. The real penetration and force of ideas {263} has come from the Calvinistic theological position which Rushdoony represents. This view has driven in some wedges.”

But Moore says that in the late 1980s, discontent arose between “those [Christians] with the ideas and those with the troops. This has to be the next part of our program. We [theonomists] have cadres; we now need some troops.”

Moore holds strong personal regard for Rushdoony’s writings. He says the theologian’s *Institutes of Biblical Law* stand next to his Bible on his bookshelf.

“We have key people in key places,” he says. “They’re within civil government but also various other spheres of subgovernment—the media, the academy, foundations. Our people are infiltrating all these subgovernments. But they’re still scattered.”

Moore says opponents have deliberately tried to isolate thinking Christians within Washington’s various spheres of government, and the result has been that the biblical worldview has been “co-opted, defeated, undermined.” He says these Christians have been treated like an “antibody,” and their impact is systematically being neutralized.

As might be expected, considering his background, Moore says there is a particular need for Christians “who see a ministry in politics” to consider the need for impacting foreign policy and

national security with a biblical worldview.

“Christian people rightly understand that survival depends on obedience to God’s law,” he says, citing Old Testament Israel’s defeats in the wake of disobedience. “People must be made to see that there must be a biblical morality—obedience to God’s law—in social issues if we are to avoid moral decay and be defeated. Social issues *are* of transcendent importance.”

Moore calls this the “trickle-up theory” of social development—where the moral standing of individuals eventually determines the degree of national security.

“It may take generations to rebuild society according to Godly principles, and in the meantime we must consider that there will be serious threats to our national security,” he says. “So some of us must be ‘standing in the gap.’”

The continuing threat to national security due to America’s moral deterioration was Moore’s key motivation in working for the Strategic Defense Initiative, which he argues is the most biblical military posture the United States could adopt because it is purely defensive in nature. He says the prevailing “defense” posture of “mutually assured destruction” (MAD) and the more recent drive toward {264} massive disarmament are both secular humanistic approaches because they make ungodly nations such as the Soviet Union the “co-guarantors of world peace.” Mutually assured destruction is unbiblical as a deterrence because it is based on the unbiblical concept of total war, he says, adding that disarmament is unbiblical because it depends on the ungodly concept of moral equivalence between nations.

MAD represents a “balance of terror,” Moore says, adding “It is wrong to base our security on the death of non-combatants.”

He contrasts the MAD concept with the annihilation God ordered Israel to conduct against Canaanites who were under God’s “judicial sentence of death.”

“We have no command to obliterate the Soviet people” or the populations of any other nation, but if nuclear war occurred, that would be the result, he says. He notes that even Israel was limited in its right to destroy the productive capacity of conquered lands. “The ultimate destiny [of an evil enemy] rests with God. Man in his arrogance thinks he’s God.”

Paul Lindstrom

Changing the world is a straightforward practical aim of Paul Lindstrom of suburban Chicago, a battle-scarred veteran of spiritual warfare whose world-changing campaigns began with himself more than 25 years ago.

Paul Lindstrom is the pastor of the Church of Christian Liberty of Arlington Heights, Illinois, the base for an educational and charitable outreach which stretches from the slums of the Windy City to homes around the world and some new classrooms in the Soviet Union.

Dr. Lindstrom, along with one other family, started the church in March 1965, while he was still in seminary. He had been student-pastoring in an Evangelical Free Church for several years but, he says, felt that God was calling him to an independent ministry. The Church of Christian Liberty began as a Sunday afternoon Bible study before later expanding into Sunday morning worship activities which it held in rented facilities. In 1966, the church purchased property and within two years moved into its own building, launching, at the same time, a Christian School which was known as Christian Liberty Academy. By 1971, the school had a full program from kindergarten through 12th grade.

The church grew rapidly during the late '60s through newspaper advertising and direct mail promotions, but soon faced a major split {265} over the subject of missions. Lindstrom, who describes himself as being an ardent premillennial, Arminian, dispensationalist at the time, says he had strong convictions that the church should be pouring much of its efforts and resources into missions—both domestic and foreign. “My parents had instilled a missionary vision in me, and my heart was very much attuned to missionary affairs,” he said.

He says he had intended his new church to become a focal point for outreach to the lost. He pushed for a policy whereby the church would give 50 percent of its income to other ministries. Others in the congregation felt that kind of giving would cripple the church's own ministry. Within a year, 30–40 members left the young congregation.

Those who remained, especially Lindstrom himself, were becoming acquainted at about that time with an emerging

theological perspective known as “dominion theology,” the theological underpinnings of the Christian Reconstruction movement. Lindstrom, who says he had never really held “antinomian” views and had begun to understand more fully the doctrine of the sovereignty of God through the writings of Arthur W. Pink, was predisposed to the view that God’s Law is basic to social order. He began to re-orient his preaching from “easy-believism” to the view that the Law of God has implications for the economy, international foreign policy, abortion and “all the issues,” he says. “That resulted in a lot of controversy,” he says, adding that the controversy attracted the attention of some news reporters who began attending his services to learn why Lindstrom was publicly advocated such things as the death penalty for abortionists.

He says he was exposed at this point to Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law*, which he says “provided the meat and potatoes for what we believed ... and expanded the horizons vastly with applications we had not considered.”

At his recommendation, the whole church began to study the *Institutes*, first the church leadership and then all the members. The work was next used as a textbook for all juniors and seniors enrolled in Christian Liberty Academy.

From 1968 through the mid-1970s, Lindstrom relates, he wrestled with one tenet of his old beliefs after another—from the doctrine of grace, to growth in sanctification, to eschatology. “The book that really put the frosting on the cake was Murray’s *The Puritan Hope*, which dealt with missions from a postmillennial perspective. “That struck a responsive chord with me. It answered questions that had plagued me for years, and it was the beginning of a new perspective in the ministry,” Lindstrom says. “I had to let the congregation know {266} that I had been teaching falsely for 10 years; I had been hoodwinked and duped. That was well received. The reconstructionist foundations which had been laid in the church prepared it for postmillennialism. One was a logical continuation of the other.”

The transition in theology went over without controversy in his church, he says, but elsewhere Lindstrom’s characteristic zealotry for newfound convictions produced substantial controversy. The first steps of his theological transformation toward Calvinism coincided with a Chicago area crusade by

Billy Graham at McCormick Place. Lindstrom's group seized the occasion to rent an outreach room at the crusade site, the only portion of the facility which was not taken up by the Graham organization. Lindstrom's group distributed "tens of thousands" of pamphlets expounding what they called "true biblical evangelism." Lindstrom's group formed what it called "Truth Squads" which put literature on cars of people attending the Graham crusade, held press conferences exposing what they said were Graham's "compromising positions and ecumenical evangelism." The rival mini-crusade created an uproar within Graham's camp, Lindstrom says, and eventually resulted in Graham's people calling the police to stop Lindstrom's efforts. Lindstrom said, however, that his group had a contract and a right to distribute its literature, and the police could do nothing. The uproar was noted by Chicago newspapers, and the Church of Christian Liberty both lost and gained some members because of it.

Lindstrom says that as he matured, he concluded that his rival mini-crusade was probably ill-conceived and unnecessarily offended people. But he remained convinced that Graham's "easy-believism" was inadequate in light of the "whole counsel of God" and that "ecumenical evangelism"—yoking up with unbelievers and celebrities who deny the central truths of Scripture—has no place in a so-called evangelistic gathering. "Ecumenicity is okay if it is biblically based and the union is with true believers. There can be no evangelism with those who deny the historic doctrines of the Christian faith," he says.

He says that as his church gradually moved into the reconstructionist position, it both lost and gained families—the net effect always being on the plus side. "The evangelical community thought we were kooks. Even within the Reformed churches, not many were applying God's Law to culture and society."

By 1975, the restructuring of the church was fairly complete, including its substitution of the Westminster Confession of Faith for its former credo, the National Association of Evangelicals' Statement {267} of Faith. The church government was restructured along Reformed lines, and covenant (infant) baptism was instituted.

"Through 10 years of Scripture study and the writings of Godly men, I came to the conclusion that covenant theology is biblical

theology,” he says. “Once the matter of the Reformed theological doctrine of grace was settled, the move toward doctrinal integrity [in other areas] was logical. ‘Grace’ gave the theological underpinning. The message of salvation is the foundation but not the end. I had been attempting reconstruction without the foundation. Moral Majorityism and similar efforts have collapsed because we can only build so far without a proper foundation—like the wise man and the foolish man (Matt. 7:24–27). the buildings looked similar, but when the winds came and the rains came down and the floods came up, the house collapsed.”

Lindstrom says the challenges and attacks he and his church faced in the 1970s and years following underscored the importance of a solid foundation. “All the trials took on a new perspective, since we were now serving a *sovereign* God. Trials were not a source of worry or viewed as a threat as they had been in the period from 1965 through 1970. We could now say, ‘Our times are in Thy hands.’ We were no longer afraid; we were much bolder, confident in the future; we saw ourselves as the church militant, beating down the gates of hell; we saw ourselves in a victory perspective,” he says.

The same period was also a time of personal activism by Lindstrom, activism which was officially unconnected to his church but which usually involved other church members and leaders and with the blessing of the church.

The most notable of his involvements was his formation and leadership of the “Remember the Pueblo Committee,” a nationwide group formed by Lindstrom and Church of Christian Liberty leaders to call international attention to the fate of crew members of a U.S. Navy ship which had been captured by the North Koreans in January of 1968. Lindstrom, national chairman of the committee, and others in the group held public rallies, testified before Congress, distributed publicity materials, attended national political party conventions, held meetings with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and congressmen, obtained and released classified material which proved the State Department had been lying about mistreatment of the crew members, and, after extensive international publicity, eventually were instrumental in gaining the release of the crew.

The committee members continued for the next several years to

involve themselves in international incidents and crises, including the {268} Soviet shooting of a U.S. aircraft over the Sea of Japan (1969), a helicopter incident over the border in North Korea (1970), protests over the visit of Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev with President Nixon, the case of a missionary in Ethiopia, and the cause of POWs and MIAs in Vietnam. These activities took Lindstrom to Southeast Asia, Europe, Algeria and elsewhere, and resulted in several arrests and incommunicado imprisonments.

Lindstrom and his colleagues continue to be social activists, with their prime focus in later years on the evil of abortion, although he did not endorse the civil-disobedience protest movement Operation Rescue. He and his church have been targeted for several legal actions—once by the IRS over the operation of the Christian school, another time over a pair of signs which the church displayed—one identifying the church and the other containing a Scripture verse (the city allowed churches only one sign). Misdemeanor and civil court actions over the sign incident stretched out over five years. When Lindstrom insisted on defending himself in court, he got into further trouble. Nevertheless, some of his attempts to stop official harassment and to broaden church rights in the legal realm were carried high into the federal court appeals system and set precedents for other churches, he says. In many of his court battles, he has directly employed biblical case law and used Rushdoony's *Institutes* to support his arguments. He says the precedents he and his church have established may prove valuable during the 1990s, when, he predicts, there will be many more attacks against Christian schools, churches, orphanages and other ministries.

Of all his actions, Lindstrom's development of Christian Liberty Academy and especially its daughter project, Christian Liberty Academy Satellite Schools (CLASS), has had perhaps the most widespread potential for changing American society and other countries around the world. CLASS has become the world's premier home schooling organization and now serves more than 25,000 students in some 15,000 families in 56 countries. CLASS's home schooling concepts have helped to revolutionize education in America and provide an outstanding alternative to both public schools and high-cost private schools. Christian Liberty Academy has also been a vehicle for Lindstrom's lifelong dedication to

missions. It has served as the parent for major Christian education efforts even in hostile environments such as Nicaragua and Moscow. Lindstrom is also now cooperating with other ministries in establishing education ministries in Eastern Europe.

The school was opened in 1968 and by 1985 had reached the {269} 175-student capacity of its building in Prospect Heights, Illinois. The sponsoring church learned of the impending sale of a major public school facility in Arlington Heights, a sprawling block wide facility crammed with educational resources, including shops, labs, library, and many other desirable features. The public school district was doing its best to facilitate sale of the school to a nearby college and sweetened the deal with a number of incentives for the college. The Church of Christian Liberty appealed widely to its constituency and spent much time in prayer about the acquisition. The facility was appraised as being worth \$20 million, but the church successfully outbid the college by a few thousand dollars to acquire it for \$1.5 million. Lindstrom calls the acquisition miraculous.

The home school operation began in 1970 as an outreach of the day school to help one family with a 9-year-old boy from the Chicago public school system who could not read nor write. The family had read about the school in an article in *Newsweek* magazine about the Christian Reconstruction movement. The story had noted that Christian Liberty Academy was successfully teaching reading and phonics to 4 and 5 year olds and was using the historic McGuffey Readers. The family had taken the boy out of public school, purchased some books at K-Mart and were trying to educate him in the basement of their home. Although the family was not a Christian one, they were impressed with what they had read about CLA and sought professional help from the school. The school tested the boy and found that he was not learning disabled” as the public school had labeled him. Christian Liberty Academy developed an individual program for him and asked his parents to report back monthly. The results were encouraging.

“We and they got very excited,” says Lindstrom. “The son was learning how to read and write. We started him with kindergarten phonics. He was excited when he realized he wasn’t stupid.”

The boy’s family shared their experience with another family which did a lot of traveling because of the father’s business. The

second family, who were Roman Catholics, usually took their children, who were fourth, fifth and eighth graders, along during these travel periods. They asked for similar assistance from Christian Liberty Academy. These people, in turn, told another family in Connecticut and that family informed a family in Georgia. By 1975, the school was providing home school services to 30 students from various states, as an experiment. Lindstrom said a few books had been written about home schooling, by such pioneers as Raymond Moore and John Holt, and a number of traditional correspondence schools had {270} long been in operation, but no one was developing a comprehensive K-12 Christian home schooling program with needed materials.

Christian Liberty Academy Satellite Schools filled the gap, providing help with teaching, legal guidance, 12-hour/day telephone consultation with home schooling parents, academic record-keeping, personally designed curricula and testing services. By the summer of 1976, CLASS officials decided they had a viable and valuable program, and the church's board of elders decided to enlarge the program to include up to 100 students.

"Almost immediately, the mail poured in. People were knocking at our doors. We were absolutely flabbergasted," says Lindstrom. "Within a matter of months we had 400 students. We had to stop enrolling. We were overwhelmed—way beyond expectations."

But the church had seen a vision of the potential and continued to develop the program. Currently, there are more than 25,000 students in all 50 states and 56 foreign countries, and the program continues to grow with "no end in sight," says Lindstrom.

The success of CLASS inspired other home schooling organizations to form, and Lindstrom's group helped a number to get organized. "We're not interested in a monopoly," he says. "We're interested in getting children out of 'Philistine' schools and the clutches of the humanists."

Lindstrom says many non-Christian families have also enrolled their children, giving the school wide opportunities to bring the Truths of the Gospel to unbelievers, and he says he expects a mass exodus from public schools in the 1990s as the AIDS epidemic and other social problems continues to spread. He estimates there may be more than 5 million children in home schools in America presently.

“There’s a lot of home schooling going on that we don’t know about. By the year 2000 there will be more children outside of the government schools than in them,” he says. He cites statistics and experiences in the Chicago public school system which he says are typical of the situation elsewhere. thousands of students who never return to school after teacher strikes, failure of bond issues, declining test scores, widespread functional illiteracy, drugs, disastrous results of sex education and so-called sensitivity training, overcrowded classrooms, and more.

“The snowball will become an avalanche. People will bail out in major proportions when they begin to realize that government education is a multimillion-dollar rip-off,” Lindstrom says.

CLA saw the need to respond to such social problems in its own backyard and organized a sister school in the inner-city of Chicago. [271] “We believe we can accomplish within the black community what we are doing here [in Chicago’s northwest suburbs],” he says.

“We look at Christian education from several vantage points—including as a missionary outreach. Of the 25,000 students we serve, we don’t know how many are unbelievers. It may be half. They’re being taught by unbelieving parents. In 15,000 homes there are 30,000 moms and dads, plus the 25,000 kids we serve. That means that more than 50,000 people are being exposed daily to Reformed theology, biblical law and reconstructionist principles in every discipline and in their Bible classes. We’re providing needed education in the Christian community, helping in their growth in sanctification, even as we’re providing the whole counsel of God as a witness to the unbelieving community.”

Lindstrom says this witness has had astonishing impact. For example, there are some 600 students in Utah and Idaho from Mormon families, including the grandchildren of the president of the Mormon Church, Ezra Taft Benson. Many of these children have gone on Mormon missions and have taken their knowledge of the Scriptures into Brigham Young University, which is now frequently recommending CLASS to “hundreds of Mormons.”

“We have seen Mormons saved by God’s grace through our materials,” Lindstrom says, adding that thousands of other former unbelievers have come to regard the Church of Christian Liberty as their church and have sought help with marriage problems, runaway children and locating biblical churches in their areas.

“The opportunities are unlimited. We are committed to the total ‘missionization’ of this group,” he says.

Lindstrom is now also spreading the word about home schooling and Christian Reconstruction through radio broadcasts and hopes to build a studio where reconstructionist programming on a broader scale can be produced. The church also is committed to enlarging its own work in the area of Christian charity and to promoting such activities throughout the Christian community in the world. This has been a weakness, because there has been a revulsion among the orthodox to the liberal “social gospel,” and that has stalled our own growth in the practical application of biblical law.”

The Church of Christian Liberty is working in inner-city Chicago, setting up a food pantry, providing clothing, housing for the homeless, helping pregnant teen-agers and street people. The church is training some 20 of its own 200 members for such work so that they can provide professional counseling in such things as food preparation and finding jobs. “We are showing them the *reasons* for {272} their economic bankruptcy and showing them how to get back to being productive persons,” Lindstrom says.

The church has developed a four-phase program of Christian charity, he says. “Circle 1” is the congregation itself, members in needs. “Circle 2” encompasses the families of children enrolled in the local campus program of Christian Liberty Academy. “Circle 3” includes home schooling families in the Greater Chicago area (50 mile radius from the church). “Circle 4” is the “community at large.”

All this is being accomplished by a small church. The Church of Christian Liberty membership consists of about 80 families, who provide the first line of funding for its vast educational and charitable activities (full-time staff: about 150) through their tithes. Additional funding comes from home schooling fees, which are remarkably low. Christian Liberty Press is now publishing books, particularly textbooks used in the CLASS program and this publishing endeavor provides additional funding. The internal publishing program has saved the school more than \$80,000 a year, Lindstrom says, noting, for example, that textbooks which formerly cost the program \$5 are now being produced at a cost of 78 cents. These textbooks are also being marketed to other

organized Christian schools.

Joseph Morecraft III

The history and development of the Church of Christian Liberty and its pastor has parallels in a number of locations around the United States. One of them is in the Atlanta, Georgia, area, where Pastor Joseph Morecraft III and the Chalcedon Presbyterian Church are an increasingly important force for re-establishment of a Christian foundation for individual lives, families, the church, the community and the larger world.

Chalcedon Presbyterian Church, located in the wealthy Atlanta suburb of Dunwoody, operates a Christian school and adult educational program; publishes a national magazine; conducts leadership seminars; publishes books; offers aid to the needy and young families; and has taken an active part in church planting, developing Christian music, video and film ministries, local and international evangelism, broad Christian Reconstruction outreaches, and Christian political action. It has maintained “high visibility” in the community in all of these fields and more.

Pastor Morecraft began his ministry “saturated” in the doctrines of southern mountain fundamentalism and dispensationalism. A proud southerner with a “good ol’ boy” manner and background, he says he {273} began preaching when he was 12 years old. Like Chicago’s Paul Lindstrom, Morecraft’s first major contact with Reformed thinking came through Arthur Pink’s *Sovereignty of God*. When he began reading the works of Calvinist and post-millennialist author Loraine Boettner, he was “enraged,” he says, adding that he could not at first put Calvinist ideas together with his view of life as he confronted it while preaching to southern coal miners. But when he began reading the books of Reformed theologian Cornelius Van Til and Reconstructionist thinker R.J. Rushdoony in the late 1960s, these authors “helped me put skin and bone on this Reformed thing.”

“I realized [from new understandings of God’s sovereignty] that I ought not to be giving altar calls because that was alien to what I was learning,” he says. Morecraft says he also wrote an article in 1970 on why he was no longer including “invitations” in his preaching. A week later he received a personal letter from

Rushdoony, commending him on his views. Coming from a man he at that time had come to greatly admire, the letter was highly flattering to the 24-year-old Morecraft, he recounts. He says he recalls that Rushdoony not only commended him as to his understanding of the inappropriateness of “altar calls” but challenged him to take a new approach to evangelism—namely to stop asking people to come to church but to depend fully upon the Holy Spirit to bring people in response to the preaching of the Word of God. Morecraft said he accepted this advice “with fear and trepidation,” but it has proven more than effective in the intervening years. He says the hundreds of members who have come into his present church over the years have done so, humanly speaking, on their own initiative, rather than through any campaigning on his part or that of the church.

Once people approach the church, however, the church takes its responsibility to them very seriously, and becoming a member of Chalcedon Presbyterian is no light matter, he relates.

“To join Chalcedon Presbyterian, you have to first make an overture,” he says. “You then have to take a 10-week class where you will receive thorough teaching on all the beliefs of the church—from creationism to theonomy.” The goal of the preparation is to make the new member fully aware of the implications and demands of his Christian confession, Morecraft says, and that includes faithful church attendance, baptism of all children and participation in the full life of the Body of Christ. Becoming an officebearer is a “long and arduous process” which includes thorough education in the Reformed faith and confessions, a three-hour theological examination, a personal interview to ensure that the prospective elder {274} or deacon is “above reproach” in his life, and then presentation to the congregation, which votes upon the nominee a week later. The addition of elders and deacons begins with a spiritual perception as to the needs to serve in these capacities, based on the growth the congregation and the calling of God. Those chosen are considered to be “separated” by God for holy service.

The church puts great emphasis on biblical forms of worship and communion, Morecraft says. The church has nourished artistic endeavors, most notable, perhaps, being the work of recording artist Judy Rogers, wife of the church’s former assistant

pastor Wayne Rogers. Mrs. Rogers' theonomic approach to contemporary Christian music, is being more and more widely heard and appreciated. The church has also sponsored ballet performances using the great church music of the ages.

Chalcedon Presbyterian Church, though relatively small, has also commissioned a number of foreign missionaries and Christian workers.

The church puts great emphasis on evangelism, and the congregation and its activities are organized around efforts to bring in those whom the Lord has called into His Body. The church is divided into elder-supervised smaller groups who are responsible for outreach and nurturing of visitors. A special non-budget fund has been established for financial assistance, usually on the basis of loans, to families and to young people with "real, dire needs." Morecraft says the deacons are regarded as the "health, education and welfare department" of the church, and are active in helping people find jobs, feeding the hungry, housing the homeless and meeting other short-term needs. The church has also invested in the creation of a Christian school for black children in mid-Atlanta and has supported crisis pregnancy ministries, homes for unwed mothers, medical education, efforts to reclaim the entertainment industry for Christ, and regional diaconal outreaches. Social and political concerns are a high priority with Morecraft and church members. The church has strong influence on a number of local and regional governmental bodies. Morecraft himself ran unsuccessfully for Congress, a campaign which he says gave the church and biblical doctrines great visibility in Georgia.

"The Kingdom of God is leaven—it must be influential," Morecraft says. "In America now politics is life; it is god; it is involved with everything. But Christ is, in fact, the Lord of all life. The state's role is to protect the freedom of the church and the advance of the gospel. A Christian state is essential to Christian Reconstruction, as is a {275} Christian church. Justice is essential to liberty," Morecraft says, explaining his emphasis on political involvement.

"The problem is really in the living rooms of America, not just with Washington. I got into politics to influence the people to stop looking to Washington as lord and savior."

Joseph McAuliffe

When Joseph McAuliffe converted to Christianity more than 20 years ago, the last thing that interested him was the restructuring of culture and society.

“From December of 1970, when I got saved, until 1976, I was your prototypical ex-hippie Jesus freak who preached Christ crucified and the church-to-be-soon-raptured,” says McAuliffe, now pastor of the Tampa Covenant Church and one of Florida’s most outspoken and active Christian reformers. “My attitude toward culture, the nation and the earth was one of studied indifference. This was Satan’s domain, so what good is it?”

Like many other young Christian Reconstruction leaders, McAuliffe’s ministry began “immersed in premillennial dispensationalism.” In his case, there was another influence — unbridled “charismania,” as he calls it. After five years of this fervor, “I still hadn’t found what I was looking for,” he says, “until a charismatic spokesman that I respected a great deal, Bob Mumford, suggested I read *The Institutes of Biblical Law*. I should have known better, coming from Mumford, a man who has expended himself living on the cutting edge of God’s purposes and therefore has developed the philosophy, ‘if you see a burning bush, don’t stop.’ Rushdoony’s book was a burning bush experience that began to radically adjust the course of my thinking and ministry. At first I vehemently opposed everything he said. After my second reading of the Introduction, where Rushdoony postulates the absolute necessity and relevancy for God’s law today, I preached a sermon against ‘neo-legalism’ in my church. But by the sixth time I read the Introduction, I realized that I was the problem, so the next week I preached against ‘neo-antinomianism’ in my church,” he recounts.

He was hooked. McAuliffe went on to order and read numerous other Rushdoony books whose expositions of biblical truths proved to be the young pastor’s “deliverance” from a short history of “bouncing from one theological extreme to another.”

“Fourteen years have passed and although the ministry of Chalcedon has not enabled me to live ‘happily ever after,’ it has {276} established several truths that have directed my ministry,” he wrote in 1990 commemorating the 25th anniversary of Chalcedon,

for which he now serves as a staff member. “Principally, they are the great truths of the Reformation, such as the sovereignty of God, the authority of Scripture, the comprehensiveness and pertinency of God’s Law, and the call of the church to disciple the nations. Truths that prepare us not only for the next age, but guide and direct us for responsible stewardship of this one as well.”

Although his ministry has since placed heavy emphasis on church planting, international relief and development, politics and community service, stewardship in the business world and understanding one’s professional calling under God have perhaps been his sharpest focus.

“My whole business interest came out of *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, he says. “After reading *The Institutes*, I realized the comprehensive nature of the Christian life. A true disciple of Christ is one who applies the whole law of God to life. Fellowship and sharing the Gospel had been the limit of the Christian life for me until then. It was now expanded to politics, economics and culture. As I surveyed all these areas, I saw how underdeveloped I was as a Christian.”

This realization occurred while McAuliffe was in business school at Bowling Green University in Ohio. “I began to study the whole subject of callings. Before, the Christian calling to me meant to go to heaven, preach the Gospel and be like Christ. I had neglected the whole idea of God calling people to various occupations. I began to study this and was impressed about Scripture’s emphasis on callings. Calvin put heavy emphasis on this earthly dimension. the minister bears no higher calling than laborers. I had to break down that paradigm and reaffirm the Christian basis of all callings of people in our church. We were escapist oriented. We would work until 5 p.m. so we could go out and do evangelism, hold prayer meetings, etc. Many men [in the church] said they believed God had called them to ‘ministry’ and were biding their time until they could do so. I had to tear down this dualistic view.”

In the mid-1970s, McAuliffe began teaching regularly on this subject: the Lordship of Christ covers every area of life; His Word speaks to every area; God’s precepts are right, totally authoritative, regardless of our desires; we have to accept their rule; the distinguishing characteristic of the Christian is that he abides in His Word; Christianity is not “cafeteria-style,” we can’t skip what

we don't like; it's more like a platter God places before us, we have to take all of it; the precepts of God speak to *everything*. {277}

McAuliffe says that like most churches, his in Bowling Green had its distinguishing personality. For this church, it was the business interests of a large number of its members, who *were* graduates of the university business school. "We seemed to concentrate on the business sphere, though we were active in other areas as well," he says.

This interest was significant in light of the fact that Northwestern Ohio in the late 70s was in an economic crisis as part of the "rust belt," a region of deteriorating and defunct heavy industry. There was what McAuliffe calls a "vocational flight" to the Sun Belt. "As elders in the church, we had to look at this. The economic situation was bad, yet we had been called to build a church. We saw that there was a transcendent economy which superseded the national economy, and we began to teach on the place of business as a governmental sphere," he says.

Providing scriptural guidance for this situation were such passages as Zechariah 1, a revelation concerning judgment and subsequent prosperity, with *craftsmen* serving as the agents of change and restoration, he says. "This released a spirit of entrepreneurship in the congregation," he continues. "We started forming business councils, starting businesses, and in two years we had formed quite a few." One of the businesses, a marketing firm, employed 75 people and became an "Inc. 500" company, one of the fastest growing of its type in the United States. Whereas unemployment in the area was around 18 percent, the joblessness among the church members was zero and church members' businesses were actually importing workers. The church established a business council consisting of all members with a calling in business and the professions. It served as a service organization to people who wanted to start businesses. It wrote business plans and served as an interim board of directors for new enterprises. Church related businesses shared resources and skills and personnel prayed with and for one another.

As the theological leader of the congregation, McAuliffe's role was to develop and teach biblical concepts of business. The members concentrated on applications, he says.

"All day, every day, businessmen are making ethical decisions,"

he says, noting the key role biblical laws play in such decision-making. This concept of vocational ministry can work in any church, he insists, including churches which are primarily farm or factory oriented.

McAuliffe says that a key component in any business enterprise is {278} “relationships,” and therefore a “relational theology” must be developed. “The Word of God develops this theme more than any other one,” he says. “Relationship breakdowns can destroy a business or a church. Whole empires can crumble. The Bible gives *primacy* to relationships. ‘This is My commandment. that ye love one another,’” he says. “Yet Christians break relations too easily. God allows breaks in relationships sometimes to test our commitment to love. In business or in the church—are we going to give up or work to reconcile? Churches that grow are those which emphasize relationship with God and with one another. Love is not a four-letter word—not wimpish as too many of us in the Reconstructionist camp seem to believe. If the goal of our heart is pure love, there will be growth. It is the most powerful evangelistic tool we have. We have all kinds of people united in Christ. They *can* get along. That’s what the church is supposed to demonstrate.”

McAuliffe says that one of his goals as a pastor is still to motivate people to “take dominion” within the area of their respective callings. Church leaders have the obligation to “equip the saints”—to restore, to equip, to mend and to edify. “People have a tremendous need today to feel secure in their callings. Most churches are saying we have to pray more, witness more, give more. We need to be saying also that we should be applying God’s Word more to take dominion. We need to ‘ordain’ people to every calling—actually laying our hands on our members of every vocation. We’ve had vocational Sundays with prayers of blessing and affirmation to faithfulness in members’ callings. This helps them have victory. So many people just dream, meander, wish for escape or to win the lottery, get an inheritance, to get out of what they’re doing. This is why most men don’t go to church and 70 percent of many churches are women. Men are called to take dominion, but the church is not telling them to do so. For most men, church is a waste of time and most men are time-conscious. They’re bored with church.”

McAuliffe’s vocational ministry also led him to create a national

newsletter, *Businessgram*, which is widely read and has won awards.

His vision of ministry in the area of vocations has followed him wherever he has gone to plant churches, beginning in Ohio, and then San Jose, California, in the 1970s, back to Bowling Green and then Dayton, Ohio in the early and mid-1980s, and finally to Tampa in 1985. Church growth has been phenomenal in each case, and members are characteristically active in their communities, with Pastor McAuliffe setting an example. He has been a leader in community service groups, governmental organizations dealing with [279] social problems, in political campaigns, anti-pornography and anti-abortion activities, religious freedom issues, international missions and relief work in Turkey, Eastern Europe and Latin America. His long-term goal is to plant a church in Moscow, USSR. "I don't believe Communism is supposed to be the final hurrah. Christianity will triumph in history," he says.

He does not predict God's timetable for change, however. "God is from the old school. He takes His time. I'd like to see things better right now, but God takes his time conforming us to our callings. We sow, but it takes time to reap," he says.

"God is creating a Gideon's Army, purging evil from His church. The church has become a reproach. Christians have lost hope. We must have the same response Nehemiah had. he mourned, fasted, interceded, and acted. Nehemiah did what is contrary to what we feel like doing. We want to give up. Instead, we must fast and pray, repent of our sins, call God to remembrance of the terms of his covenant. The church is be salt, to disciple, to prevail against the gates of hell, to claim the world. These are God's promises that are not a reality in our hour—and rightly so, due to our sins and lethargy. We must rebuild the walls. That's the duty of pastors—to call people to rebuild in their vocations. That's what makes me tick."

Peter Dys

Down the Florida Gulf Coast a short distance lies Fort Myers, home of a model program demonstrating the results of one church denomination's vision for care of its elderly. Shell Point Village, a privately operated "life-care facility" for the elderly is proving

that individual self-government and Christian commitment are a viable alternative to state welfarism in meeting the needs of the elderly.

Shell Point Village is directed by *Peter Dys*, a skilled administrator with a biblical worldview and professional background in social work. Mr. Dys, former architect and director of a local government program for the aging in a Northern state, has seen his field from both sides, state and private.

Some 25 years ago, Dys intended to become a preacher and entered a pre-seminary course at Dordt College, a church college in Iowa, but, as he tells it, “during the first couple of years there I was not at peace with the idea of pastoring. As I focused on my skills and gifts in leadership, social services emerged as the area where God seemed to be calling me.”

As a student, Dys helped establish a recreational program at a {280} local retirement home, and his calling to be of service to the elderly was confirmed—he took great satisfaction in “being around the old and the wise.”

He went on to graduate school at West Virginia University, where he was astonished by the strength of the effort to destroy the Christian understanding about social problems. “They did everything possible to knock out your philosophy. My background was to be ‘salt,’ so I constantly challenged their approaches.” Among the disturbing things he confronted were homosexuality and group marriages among his fellow students. “These were the people who would soon be guidance counselors,” he says, adding, “I seriously considered dropping out, but I needed the degree. So I determined to develop my own ideas. They claimed to be champions of tolerance and academic liberality, so I confessed that I was ‘narrow’ and I told them that if they were as tolerant as they professed to be my views should be no problem for them. I openly discussed, for example, a Christian perspective on homosexuality, saying that the inner man, the spiritual essence of a man, is the key to his behavior. When my classmates and professors showed any sign of intolerance, I reminded them of their profession of tolerance and insisted that they listen to me because they claimed openness.

“I was booted.”

His outspoken courage coupled with his academic excellence had

one surprising effect, however. Others in the academic community who had shared his views, but had been too timid to express them, began to come forward. "When I took a strong stand, when I spoke up and when I achieved top rank academically, others came out of the woodwork. I was greatly encouraged," he said. "But their timidity showed what was lacking in evangelicalism. They did not know what they believed and were not able to defend and analyze and apply the faith."

As a result, he says, even many Christians in social work fields accept the world's explanations for social and psychological disorders. Homosexuality and mental disorders, for example, as declared to be involuntary illnesses and part of an individual biological make-up which must be accepted by the individual and society. They are never recognized as the results of sin. "Most behaviors which society now calls mental illnesses stem in fact from some unbiblical attitude or behavior in the person's life. The world's answer is that it's society's fault or environmental and the troubled persons must simply accept himself as he is and society must also accept him or consider his behavior just an aberration," he says. (Dys {281} distinguishes so-called psychotherapeutical "illnesses" as described above from certain emotional stresses which are often organically based and which he says are a medically treatable manifestations of the frailty of man.)

After leaving graduate school, Dys took a position with Lancaster County (PA) Family and Children's Services, a United Way funded public agency where he found a continuation of the worldly approach he had fought at the university.

"I found I was being confronted with a whole parade of personal, family and social problems which I could not help without applying biblical answers," he says, adding that, despite policy restrictions, he indeed did apply those answers. When clients said they did not want to follow his biblically based guidance, he would tell them that it was like a doctor's prescription: sometimes the medicine tastes bad, but if you don't take it, you'll continue to live with your problem or you'll die, he says.

"I didn't necessarily preach with the Scripture in hand, but I applied Scriptural norms," he says. "The frustration I felt was seeing societal whims and wishes being applied as solutions. It was like shifting sand. The prescribed solutions changed daily."

He says he would express his frustrations to co-workers and this would often result in philosophical discussions which got down to basic questions like, "Why are we here? What's our purpose in this agency?" The answers were usually something vague such as "to make the world a better place," but he says he would then ask, "How? By what means?" He says he would take such opportunities to bring the discussion "all the way back to creation" and the question of "who is man? That's really the fundamental question of social services."

"I never had the freedom to provide the biblical answer in the context of a public program, but I did share the Gospel individually," he says.

Because of his lingering frustration with public policy restrictions, Dys began to explore other career opportunities—including working with a denominational anti-poverty and relief program in Kentucky. But as he was considering that, Lancaster County officials asked him to develop a new county program for the elderly. "God said, 'Take the Lancaster County job,'" Dys relates. With a minimal budget and a three-month deadline, Dys pressed into the task, seeing an opportunity to apply biblical norms at the formative stage of a social program. "Old people don't want psychoanalysis, but practical help with real needs," he says. {282}

His methods proved phenomenally successful. During the next 11 years, he developed a program which caught the interest of Congress and has served as a model for similar programs across the country. Whereas his initial authorization had been to handle 50 cases, his program eventually grew to an area wide agency with a staff of 70 and a \$4 million budget funded from 13 different funding sources to avoid a drain on the public treasury.

No lover of public bureaucracy, Dys nevertheless committed himself to providing the best possible services for the needy elderly "because no one else was doing it. The need had to be met. As a Christian, I determined to do it with available resources." He emphasized stewardship and accountability and managed to turn back "hundreds of thousands of dollars" of tax funds—an achievement which resulted only in complaints from certain federal agencies which were trying to build cases for additional congressional funding.

I was involved in a public program only because families,

churches, schools and communities were failing—and in most cases it was a willing abdication,” he says. Dys says he was angered by the fact that Christian conservatives would criticize the growth of public agencies such as his when at the same time they were cheating on their taxes and failing to meet their biblical mandate to provide for the needy. “Public agencies were at least filling the gap, and many Christians simply had a ‘retreat mentality’: let them [public agencies] do it and then stand back and criticize.”

Dys’ success at the county level made him a valuable consultant at higher levels, and he soon was amazed at the impact a biblically guided and well-informed Christian could have on policymaking. “By my testimony [before the state legislature, Congress and various agencies] and a thorough knowledge of my beliefs, I could stand up and say what needed to be said. I was astonished at how I could change policies with a word and a demonstration of my knowledge. Christians really *can* make a difference, an incredible difference, when we simply express our own expectations and standards. I tell my staff even now that they can influence people if they know what they believe. We need to always be conscious of when and how we can influence.”

For his innovations in Lancaster County, Dys’ ideas were favorably reported by *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal* and national television programs.

Christians can do things better. We don’t stretch as we should or could,” he says. “I’ve testified before the U.S. Senate and House {283} subcommittees and I’ve spoken at many national conferences—not because I’m an expert but because I have a unique perspective.”

His discussions during a White House Conference on Aging a few years ago spurred several church leaders who were participating to start their own programs of help for the elderly, he says.

Dys is a walking encyclopedia of information and statistics on America’s growing problem of dealing with the needs of the elderly and the social costs of retirement. He says the elderly are the fastest growing segment of the U.S. population and that three-quarters of the elderly sector will be age 75 or older by 2000. Americans are reaching age 65 at a rate of 5,000 a day and the population aged 85 or higher is now 5 million. There are more than 30,000 Americans over age 100. In the early 1900s, the ratio of workers to retirees

was 9 to 1. It is now about 5 to 1, and by 2030 will be 3 to 1. At the same time that the aging sector is growing and the average age of the elderly is increasing, the birth rate is declining. More than 28 percent of the national budget is now spent on costs related to old age—Social Security and medical benefits topping the list. The cost of medical care for the elderly is now considered by top government officials as “out of control,” he says.

The national aging process is taking place at a time when youth is idolized, he says. Old people are depicted by the entertainment media as idiots, not as objects of reverence or sources of wisdom. “Older people are considered a liability. Nurses shun geriatrics because they simply dislike the elderly. Doctors don’t care to treat the old. Age, not medical need, often determines treatment,” he says.

These facts and others like them spell out a formula for disaster for the aged. As Dys describes the formula. The “me-centeredness” of the young + the general attitude against old people + the high cost of medical care + runaway inflation + legal precedents for euthanasia set in abortion cases + statements by political leaders that the elderly should get out of the way and make room for the young + modern medical and social theories about the quality of life = it is logical to kill off the elderly as a burden to society.

Dys says that the tragedy of present attitudes about old people is that they are simply not founded in fact. “I am so richly blessed by the wisdom of the elderly and by hearing of their experiences,” he says. “The beautiful part of aging as a Christian is to look back and see what and why God did certain things, and that gives you confidence for the future. Seeing God’s sovereign plan unfolding in your own life...you may not like your surroundings or circumstances but seeing that God brought you here...that’s reassuring. We still have with us a {284} generation who pioneered in this country. They left wealth, fame and fortunes in the old country to seek freedom here. Many lost all they had gained materially in the Depression, yet they didn’t cave in, but rebuilt their lives and the nation. We are letting these people die without recording their achievements. The elderly are often self-effacing; they back away from leadership. We in society encourage them to step aside, rather than employing their experience, wisdom, and abilities. Mandatory retirement schemes leave them with no

purpose, no meaning, and often drive them into senility—which is 90 percent a result of social conditions, not medical conditions. Men who retire without goals die within 36 months on the average.”

He likes to remind listeners that “old age” is a relative term, and he points to the population of Shell Point Village to illustrate. “We have a 44-year age spread here, but they’re all called old people,” he chuckles.

“Here at Shell Point Village, we have a thousand years of experience. This generation has seen unprecedented technological development—from wagon trains to space travel,” a fact which he says strikes untold admiration for his clients within him. He agonizes over contrasting attitudes many other for-profit providers of health care for the elderly express: they just want old bodies who have one foot in the grave so they can collect their money before they die to make room for the next old person—“get ‘em old, treat ‘em bad, and move ‘em out.” At Shell Point Village, the motto is. “Dedicated to the glory of God and service to His people.”

“I ask myself frequently: who is man? Why do we want to keep the old healthy and happy?” Dys says. He finds answers in such places as the Book of Ecclesiastes where the need to work to the best of one’s ability is highlighted; where we are told to rejoice in our youth but remember that God brings us into judgment and accountability. There are ideas which show that people must plan for their old age during their youth—to prepare to compensate for the inevitable losses of old age in terms of health and wealth, he says.

The Shell Point Village “life-care” concept is designed to give anyone an opportunity to buy old-age care in a Christian context while he or she is still young or, similarly, for families or churches to invest in the eventual necessary care of their relatives. Essentially, it is a residential investment plan which includes medical care as needed progressively through advancing age. The investor enters the Village at retirement age (set according to the investor’s choice) and lives in accommodations suited to his or her medical and {285} physical abilities. As health and ability changes, the resident is moved into accommodations with increasing levels of care. Thus the range is from independent living situations to full-time intensive care situations. The program is financially arranged

to provide for those who may run out of personal or family funds. No resident has ever been shifted onto public welfare. The program guarantees health care and a home for life at little or no additional cost beyond the original investment.

Shell Point Village was started by the Christian and Missionary Alliance denomination as a way to provide for and reward its retiring missionaries, pastors and church workers, but it has since been extended to include anyone. The transformation of the facility to a viable business was to a large extent Dys' doing. The Village, set on a now grassy island (reclaimed from coastal swampland), dotted with palm trees and graced by sea breezes, was in danger of crumbling because it had been run unrealistically by ministers who were not necessarily gifted in administration. When Dys was added to the board, he brought in professional expertise and experience which the facility needed. Reciprocally, the opportunity to serve at Shell Point Village gave him outlets for innovations which he says had been consistently stifled while in government service, where constant shifts in political policy whims seemed designed to prevent progress and innovation.

Dys was later hired as executive director of the Village and has taken a no-nonsense business-like approach to administration and development of the now 23-year-old community. "We can only give what we earn," he says. "We can maximize the output of those who have the [spiritual] gift of giving. We are agents for the givers in providing the comfort and care that's needed for the aging population, so they can remain as productive as possible to the day they die."

Dys calls aging a "great leveler in society—no matter what your job, or wealth or status is, all deteriorate in the same way." This makes the elderly vulnerable in many ways, including vulnerable to the message of the Gospel, he says. "Many have been saved here through our deeds and witness. When we say here that we do things to the glory of God, we realize that our work must be excellent. How can we say we are God's people and do anything less than a superior job?"

That attitude is more than obvious to the visitor to Shell Point Village: the place is a thing of delight and beauty and the entire program exudes quality. "This is a high-class place," Dys readily [286] admits. "We see no moral superiority in being poor." The

facility spends nearly \$15 million a year on salaries for its 350 staff members and up to \$100 million on its physical plant. Shell Point Village residents return the favor, as it were. The Village church, whose entire membership consists of elderly residents, has given millions of dollars to missions and other activities of the Christian and Missionary Alliance over the years, Dys says.

“Our desire is to provide the least restrictive environment and maximize independence, which promotes dignity. We force self-sufficiency as much as possible. We provide hope [to those who must move into more intensive care units] by keeping their [independent living apartments] available to them. If they can’t stay in their apartments and they are reassigned, but they later recover, we make a new apartment available. It’s compassionate care and it eases the mind. This is a unique institution in the fullness of its provision and the number and level of its services. Here we also offer spiritual care. To think of elderly care as purely financial is blatant humanism.”

THE MINISTRY OF CHALCEDON

(Proverbs 29:18)

CHALCEDON (kal-SEE-don) is a Christian educational organization devoted exclusively to research, publishing, and to cogent communication of a distinctly Christian scholarship to the world at large. It makes available a variety of services and programs, all geared to the needs of interested laymen who understand the propositions that Jesus Christ speaks to the mind as well as the heart, and that His claims extend beyond the narrow confines of the various institutional churches. We exist in order to support the efforts of all orthodox denominations and churches.

Chalcedon derives its name from the great ecclesiastical Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), which produced the crucial Christological definition. "Therefore, following the holy Fathers, we all with one accord teach men to acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, at once complete in Godhead and complete in manhood, truly God and truly man..." This formula challenges directly every false claim of divinity by any human institution. state, church, cult, school, or human assembly. Christ alone is both God and man, the unique link between heaven and earth. All human power is therefore derivative; Christ alone can announced that "all power is given unto men in heaven and in earth' (Matt. 28:18). Historically, the Chalcedonian creed is therefore the foundation of Western liberty, for its sets limits on all authoritarian human institutions by acknowledging the validity of the claims of the One who is the source of true human freedom (Gal. 5:1).

Christians have generally given up two crucial features of theology that in the past led to the creation of what we know as Western civilization. They no longer have any real optimism concerning the possibility of an earthly victory of Christian principles and Christian institutions, and they have also abandoned the means of such a victory in external human affairs. a distinctly biblical concept of law. The testimony of the Bible and Western history should be clear. when God's people have been confident about the ultimate earthly success of their religion and committed socially to God's revealed system of external law, they have been victorious. When either aspect of their faith has declined, they have lost ground. Without optimism, they lose their zeal to exercise dominion over God's creation (Gen. 1:28); without revealed law, they are left without guidance and drift

along with the standards of their day.

Once Christians invented the university; now they retreat into little Bible colleges or sports factories. Once they built hospitals throughout Europe and America; now the civil governments have taken them over. Once Christians were inspired by “Onward, Christian Soldiers”; now they see themselves as “poor wayfaring strangers” with “joy, joy, joy down in their hearts” only on Sundays and perhaps Wednesday evenings. They are, in a word, pathetic. Unquestionably, they have become culturally impotent.

Chalcedon is committed to the idea of Christian reconstruction. I is premised on the belief that ideas have consequences. It takes seriously the words of Professor FA. Hayek. “It may well be true that we as scholars tend to overestimate the influence which we can exercise on contemporary affairs. But I doubt whether it is possible to overestimate the influence which ideas have in the long run.” If Christians are to reconquer lost ground in preparation for ultimate victory (Isa. 2, 65, 66), they must rediscover their intellectual heritage. They must come to grips with the Bible’s warning and its promise. “Where there is no vision, the people perish. but he that keepeth the law, happy is he” (Prov. 29:18). Chalcedon’s resources are being used to remind Christians of this basic truth. what men believe makes a difference. Therefore, men should not believe lies, for it is the truth that sets them free (John 8:32).

Finis

